NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

A

COMPANION

TO THE

HIGHER

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

47965

BY

ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF LOGIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO
1874.

A. KING AND [illegible] PE MUSIC, CLASSICAL AND GENERAL
PI[illegible]RS, AND [illegible]EREOTYPERS, ABERDEEN.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE DEFINITIONS IN GRAMMAR.

PAGE

The scope of Grammar itself left at the outset undefined..... 1
Definition is needed mainly for the Parts of Speech..... ,,
Definition highly important..... ,,
The right foundation—the function of words in the sentence.... ,,

DEFINITION OF THE NOUN.

Principle of definition ; the two views..... 2
The common definitions stated ; serious objections..... ,,
Definitions by classification of meanings tested..... 3
'The Noun *names*' true, but not the main point for definition..... ,,
Definitions in transition, half-way between the two views..... 4
The true definition, according to *function:* the characteristic action of the Noun is as *Subject* or *Object* of a sentence..... ,,
Separation from Pronoun and from Infinitive..... 5

DEFINITION OF THE PRONOUN.

The common definitions ; criticism of these..... 5
Are the other Parts of Speech 'substituted'?..... 6
Pronouns stand for Infinitives and Clauses, as well as for Nouns..... ,,
Special difficulties as to Interrogative and Personal Pronouns..... ,,
The Pronoun not the sole substitute for the Noun ; other devices..... 7
Grounds for a juster view of the Pronoun..... ,,

DEFINITION OF THE ADJECTIVE.

The old definition, and varieties of it..... 8
What precise change results from the union of an Adjective with a (class) Noun?..... ,,
Narrowed class with more class marks..... 9

DEFINITION OF THE VERB.

The Verb is the Predicate word ; it asserts or denies..... 10
The Inflections few, yet (as far as they go) characteristic marks ,,

PAGE
The 'Finite' verb alone concerned in the definition 10
No objection to be drawn from the Incomplete verbs ..... ,,
Shortcomings of the old definition exposed 11
Extensive adoption of the new method 12

DEFINITION OF THE ADVERB.

Adverb is to verb as adjective to noun 12
Various wording of the definition; the best form ..... ,,
Definition and division sometimes confounded ..... ,,

DEFINITION OF THE PREPOSITION.

Previous definitions 13
Difficulty in marking off the Preposition from the Conjunction ,,
Expression of Direction the starting-point 14
Prepositions stand between verbs and nouns, intimating the course of the verb action ..... ,,
They connect noun and noun; explanation 15
They connect adjective and noun; explanation ..... ,,
Final definition ..... ,,

DEFINITION OF THE CONJUNCTION.

Conjunctions couple affirmations 16
They connect noun and noun (like Prepositions). Explanation: contracted sentences, and separate parts of a whole sentence ..... ,,
Separation from the Preposition 17

THE USE OF THE DEFINITIONS IN TEACHING.

Rule of Thumb 17
Empirical parsing a mere evasion ..... ,,
In thorough teaching the definitions must be constantly appealed to ..... ,,
Fundamental importance of the definitions re-asserted ..... ,,

INFLECTION.

Where should Inflection be taught? Question discussed 18
Most grammarians treat Inflection under the same head with Definition and Classification ..... ,,
Superior reasons for separate handling ..... ,,

DERIVATION.

Heads of the subject 19
Practical purposes of the treatment ..... ,,

SYNTAX.

Analysis of Sentences not further exemplified 19
Danger of pushing the formal scheme too far ..... ,,
Order of Words the paramount consideration in Syntax ..... ,,

PARTS OF SPEECH.

THE NOUN.

CLASSIFICATION OF NOUNS.

PAGE

Principle of Classification :—What grammatical purpose is to be served ?..... 20
The common definition of the noun, not a definition, but a sort of sub-division..... ,,
The actual classification is on a different plan..... ,,
Enumeration of five classes (each with grammatical peculiarities) ; PROPER, COMMON, ABSTRACT (adjective and verb), and the recently added MATERIAL and COLLECTIVE Nouns .... ,,

PROPER NOUNS.

Range of exemplification extended..... 22
Disturbing considerations : departures from type—Some Singular names are extended to new individuals..... 23
Other Proper names (*e.g.*, of families) assume temporarily the aspect of class names ..... ,,
Special explanation of the term 'Meaningless'..... 24
Probably all Proper names once had meaning..... ,,
Why 'Meaningless', then ? The meaning tends to drop away, the name becoming a mere mark to know the object by..... ,,
Proper Nouns are often many-worded names..... 25
Mixed Proper (or Singular) names..... ,,

COMMON NOUNS.

The typical example is common, general, significant, and a class noun..... 26
It applies to each of a plurality of agreeing individuals in virtue of their agreement..... ,,
The signification is the sum of the agreements..... ,,
Significant names are frequently Singular..... ,,
Abstract names used figuratively..... ,,
General names limited (especially by demonstrative and possessive adjectives) so as to mean a single individual.. ,,

ABSTRACT NOUNS.

The Adjective a fruitful source of these..... 27
The Adjective Abstract names in separation the point of community of individuals entitled to the adjective..... ,,
By what marks may the Abstract noun be recognized ? ..... ,,
The Verb Abstracts are of higher importance, grammatically... 28
Abstracts whose origin (adj. or verb) is not obvious 29
History of some examples traced..... ,,
A few Abstract Nouns come from other (chiefly class) nouns.... 30

Use of Adjective Abstract Nouns as Common Nouns.

PAGE

Abstract Nouns often take the character of Common nouns—a plural, or 'a, an' in the singular 30
The meaning is no longer abstract ..... ,,
Conversions often uncalled for 31

Use of Verb Abstracts as Common Nouns.

A Verb Abstract often takes a plural (or the indefinite article in the singular) 32
The meaning ceases to be abstract, denoting special instances or occasions of the action ..... ,,
This conversion also very liable to abuse ..... ,,

MATERIAL NOUNS.

[illegible]s of such Names; Examples 33
[illegible]nes converted into Class Nouns (by plural or indefinite [illegible]); familiar examples ..... ,,
New meanings developed 34
Various examples waver between Material and Abstract; decision not essential;—why? 35

THE PRONOUN.

Distinction of Persons and Things, inoperative in nouns, prominent here 36
The so-called Third Personal Pronouns classed as Demonstratives. Why? ..... ,,

PRONOUNS OF THE FIRST PERSON.

Various applications of 'we' 37
Different uses are often mixed, or occur close together 38
Resulting ambiguity; methods of cure ..... ,,
'I' for 'we'; great force of singularity ..... ,,

PRONOUNS OF THE SECOND PERSON.

Anomalous usages; motive discussed and illustrated 39
The familiar 'thou' early used for energetic contempt 40
'You' representative; when allowable, and with what effect ..... ,,
'Thou' and 'you' are often carelessly mixed ..... ,,
Older distinction of 'ye' and 'you' ..... ,,

DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

The careful use of these is surpassingly important for clearness .. 41
Regrettable weakness of English in demonstrative pronouns .... ,,
Shortcomings are in part made good by adjectives ..... ,,
Main rules for reference to antecedent: Prominence and Proximity 42
Examples: with casual notice of other devices for reference .... ,,

PREFACE.

In supplying a series of examples, together with a running commentary, to accompany and follow out the Higher English Grammar, my aim is to be thore practical, that is, to dwell upon such principles and usages as bear most directly upon the art of writing well.

Seeing that precision in grammar must begin from correctly defining the PARTS OF SPEECH, in an Introductory chapter, I have discussed the various current definitions, and have given reasons for my own.

In exemplifying the Parts of Speech in the detail, the next point, after settling the definitions, is to subdivide and classify each upon some grounds strictly pertaining to grammar.

As regards Nouns, there are four classes grammatically important—Proper, Common, Material, Abstract. I point out the niceties connected with these classes; and exemplify at some length the converting of Material and of Abstract nouns into Common or Class nouns. I take special notice of the Abstract Nouns originating in Verbs.

The Pronoun necessarily comes in for a large share of attention. Some niceties in the Personal Pronouns are briefly touched upon. The negligent use of the Demonstratives—he, she, it, they—is among the chief

remaining causes of obscurity in good composition of the present day; and to put pupils on their guard, I have adduced a copious array of instances of the mischief. Not inferior in importance are the Relative Pronouns. Regarding as unsatisfactory the prevalent uses of 'who' and 'which', I give numerous examples, so as to enable the effects to be felt. A considerable space is also given to the pronoun couples obtained from the demonstrative adjectives.

Under the Adjective, I have discussed the employment of Nouns as adjectives; pointing out that this usage leaves a gap to be filled up by the reader, and that with many adjectives so called we are placed in the same position. I also exemplify a number of delicacies of construction in the Numeral Adjectives and the Demonstratives; and conclude with a notice of the irregularities in the use of the Articles.

In connexion with the Verb, I consider it of great importance to show that verb accompaniments often adhere to the verbal Abstract Noun; and urge the propriety of noticing the fact in parsing. It grows out of the extensive operation of shortening sentences by converting clauses into words or phrases; and involves a further transformation of abverbs into adjectives.

Reasons of pure grammar do not fully justify the difficult classifications of Adverbs, Prepositions, and Conjunctions. The real justification is given; namely, that in these three parts of speech, and more particularly in the two last, the meanings of individual words are discriminated. In carrying out this view, a selection is made of some leading Prepositions and Conjunctions, and their use and misuse copiously exemplified.

In the treatment of INFLECTION, the same stress is laid upon whatever is deemed of practical interest. With respect to Gender, Number, and Case, I enquire how far our several usages affect the clear conveyance of meaning; and suggest the motives of preference where there is a choice.

The largest department of Inflection is of course the Conjugation of the Verb. There is here wide scope for the study of delicate constructions. The first leading topic comprises the boundary line between the Infinitive and the Participle, which in several of our idioms seems to be stealthily crossed. A good many pages of examples are devoted to the complications of 'Shall' and 'Will', and to the still greater complications of 'Should' and 'Would'. Notice is taken of the delicacies of the Subjunctive mood. And finally, additional illustrations are afforded of the leading distinctions of Tense.

The first part of DERIVATION takes in the Sources of the Vocabulary. Under this head, the absorbing question, in the practical point of view, is—What are the distinctive functions of the Saxon and the Classical names for the same things? At the outset, I state generally what would appear to be the respective merits and deficiencies of the two classes of words. I next adduce a series of examples to impress these peculiarities; and point the conclusion that our habitual tendency is to draw to excess upon the classical part of the vocabulary.

The second part of Derivation is the Composition of Words. In the grammar, the prefixes and suffixes are given briefly; here they are detailed with exhaustive completeness. To aid the teacher in making these dry bones live, no effort is spared to relieve the tediousness of the enumeration, and to make it of avail in

aiding composition. Besides distinguishing between Saxon or native and Classical prefixes and suffixes, I single out for special notice all those that have a felt meaning, as well as those that are still used for new compounds. Such as comply with neither of those conditions may be looked upon as dead or dormant, and a reference to them is of use only to impress by contrast the living particles. One of the uses of this part of Derivation being to preserve the consistency of the language in the composition of words, instances of irregularity are cited as warnings.

Derivation, in both heads, is the part of grammar that most directly operates in enlarging the pupils' vocabulary. This, however, is an effect that will be produced only in proportion to the living interest that can be evoked in teaching the department.

In SYNTAX, as in the other portions, I avoid repeating the general rules of the Grammar. The first point selected for discussion is the use to be made of that accident and superfluity of language—the scheme of Concords. Besides exemplifying the doubtful Concords of Number in nouns of multitude and in the couplings of singular nouns, I have endeavoured to specify the occasions when these concords impart energy and emphasis to the meaning.

The largest part of Syntax, and the most important thing in the whole compass of Grammar, is the consideration of the Order of Words. The placing of words, phrases, and clauses, in the entire sentence, vitally effects both the clearness and the force of the composition; and I have thought nearly one fifth of the volume not too much for exemplifying the

modes of arrangement under many varieties of sentence structure.

I have raised sundry questions not previously agitated within the sphere of English Grammar; and have in various instances expressed peculiar views upon the recognised topics. Reasons, good or bad, have been offered for all the conclusions arrived at.

Perhaps much that is here laid down, even if not condemned as erroneous, will be treated as over-refining and impossible to carry out. The reply is, that whatever is suggested as an improvement is worthy of being considered. In the rapid dispatch of actual business, our composition cannot always embody even the merits that we are masters of; yet, in the great variety of literary efforts, there will come a time and a place for every genuine refinement.

Long experience has convinced me that the greatest trouble in beginning the study of composition is to fix the attention upon anything in particular; to find any exercise to the judgment, or any motive to choose between competing modes of expression. Hence, in teaching English, the most effective course of all seems to me to be this: having selected an exemplary passage, first to assign its peculiar excellence and its deficiency, and next to point out what things contribute to the one, what to the other, and what are indifferent to both. The pupils are thus accustomed to weigh every expression that comes before them, and this I take to be the beginning of the art of composition.

Although professing to be a Companion to my Higher English Grammar, the present work may be readily

understood by pupils taught upon any of the grammars now in use, and indeed by any person of ordinary intelligence. It is not so much a compilation from writers on English as a reproduction of the remarks that have occurred to myself in studying the devices of composition. Works of this class cannot be too numerous, and they do not necessarily exclude each other.

ABERDEEN, *September, 1874.*

PAGE
Balanced structure lightens ambiguity.... 43
Insertion of explanatory noun.... ,,
Various modes of reference of IT :
Backward to noun, infinitive, or clause.... 44
Forward to infinitive or clause.... ,,
'It' anticipates a noun only in familiar composition.... 45
Varieties of the Vague use of 'it'.... ,,
Ambiguity arises from mixture of references.... ,,
Balanced structure mitigates ambiguity.... 46
Examples of ambiguous construction ; remedies.... ,,
'It is, was, &c.'—valuable idiom for emphatic inversions.... ,,
Alternative modes :—Corresponding verbal noun.... ,,
'There is' ; more general subject ; complement prominent in adverbial form ; personal subject.... 47
'It is' to be reserved mostly for prospective reference.... ,,
Illustrative cases continued.... 48
THEY (no sex) confounds Persons and Things.... 50
Perplexed references exemplified.... ,,
Criticism and disentanglement of such cases.... ,,
Balanced structure still advantageous.... 51
'They' incomplete without adjunct ; simulated forward reference.... 52

THIS and THAT as Pronouns.

Contrasted reference ; analogy of Latin usage.... 52
'This' and 'That' more energetic than the ordinary demonstratives.... ,,
Modes of reference exemplified (compare 'It') :
'This' refers backward to noun, infinitive, or clause.... ,,
—forward to infinitive or clause.... 53
'That' refers only backward, to noun, infinitive, or clause ,,
Substitution for 'it' and 'they' a gain in clearness, emphasis, and variety.... 54
'That' and 'This' save repetition of names, especially in elevated language.... 56
They point out individuals (not previously named) as nearer or remoter ; mostly in elevated style.... 57
THAT OF (French idiom) active in saving repetition of nouns.... ,,
Tendency to overdo it, to the prejudice of native forms.... ,,
Equivalent modes :—Conversion by the Possessive Case,—by the prepositional adverbial phrase.... 58
For emphasis, the noun must be repeated.... ,,
'That of' omitted ; comma or dash, or explanatory phrase sometimes supplied.... 59
More extensive remodelling.... ,,
In comparisons, balance usually demands repetition of the noun ,,
Further examples showing alternative forms.... 60
'That' takes also participles and clauses as adjuncts.... ,,
Absolute use of 'that' : apparent forward reference.... ,,

The INDEFINITE DEMONSTRATIVE pronouns.... 61

PAGE
'They'—the popular voice; examples and equivalents 61
'One' is more important ..... ,,
Special idiom for reference to 'one' 62
Substitutes remarked upon: 'I' or 'we', 'a man' ..... ,,
—'men', 'you' (familiar, vivid) 63

RELATIVE PRONOUNS.

The Co-ordinating use explained 63
'Who' and 'which' to be kept solely for Co-ordination; equivalents ..... ,,
Typical cases ..... ,,
Relative clauses (co-ordinating) of adverbial nature 64
'Which' with infinitive or clause as antecedent 65
The Restrictive use explained ..... ,,
The restrictive relative occasionally resolved 66
'That' to be kept solely for Restriction ..... ,,
The idiomatic use absolutely necessary for clearness ..... ,,
Ambiguous constructions exemplified ..... ,,
Relatives overdone: means of relief suggested 67
Rare use of 'that' as co-ordinating; instances 68
'That' after Personal pronouns: discussion ..... ,,
Specially urgent cases for 'that':
After a Superlative; after 'only', 'all' 69
After a Negative; in other (more or less) similar cases 70
'Whose', possessive relative, both co-ordinating and restrictive 71
Ambiguity avoided by substitutions—'of whom', 'of which', &c. ..... ,,
The Adverbial Equivalents are highly important for variety and lightness ..... ,,
Relative adverbs stand for preposition and pronoun: 'where' and compounds, 'whence', 'whither', 'when', for 'in (on, at, by, to, from, &c.), which' 72
But (by ellipsis) an emphatic substitute for 'that—not' ..... ,,
Must be preceded by a negative (or equivalent) 73
As (also by ellipsis) is used for 'that' after 'such' and 'same' 74
Miscellaneous examples; criticisms ..... ,,
Relative resolved for emphasis 75
Incongruous forms of adjunct objectionable ..... ,,
Adjective (for adverbial) clause after 'so' 76
Preposition at end of adjective clause often dropped, especially in phrases of time 78
Participle for clause 79
Disadvantages of 'that' enumerated:
A preposition is thrown to the end of the clause ..... ,,
'That' may be ambiguous through not distinguishing persons and things; as with neutral antecedents like 'one', 'all' 80
Gratuitous re-assertion of the distinction censurable ..... ,,
'That' might be an awkward transition from 'whose' introducing a previous co-ordinate clause 81

PAGE

Older relative usages :
Scriblerus, Milton, St. Matthew..... 82
'Such who (that, as),—whose,—where,—wherein'..... 83
Interchange of 'who' and 'which'. '*The* which'..... ,,
Adverbial substitutes carried to excess..... 85

THE ADJECTIVE.

The Definition further explained..... 86
Typical adjectives (besides narrowing a class, and adding to its meaning) have three characteristics—comparison, singleness of meaning, and being intelligible in themselves..... ,,

THE ADJECTIVE CLAUSE.

Any adjective may be expanded into an equivalent clause..... 87
Clauses are useful for emphatic or complicated qualifications... ,,

Adjective Clauses abbreviated.

Participle and Prepositional Phrase give the full sense concisely 88
Omitted words essential to the full sense are to be supplied from the hearer's previous knowledge..... ,,

THE NOUN AS ADJECTIVE.

Nouns do the work of Adjectives : an extensive process..... 89
Such nouns want the three additional peculiarities of the typical adjectives ; examples discussed..... ,,
Usage explained by ellipsis of known particulars..... 91
Many such cases were never full clauses, mere assimilations.... 92
Used in headings, titles, &c. ; in specifying material..... ,,
Contrast with the classical usage..... ,,
Brevity gained without loss of intelligibility..... ,,

ANOMALOUS OR ARTIFICIAL ADJECTIVES.

Instances examined : Adjective form with Noun force..... 93
The sense has to be filled up as for nouns..... ,,
The formal Adjective, where not misleading, is a gain only to the ear : suffix 'an'..... 95
Great variety of the Adjective form in elliptical combinations.. 96
Extreme illustration from Latin : nouns must take Adjective form..... ,,
Artificial Adjectives become regular by settling down to a constant or uniform meaning..... 97
This accounts for Adjectives derived from nouns by suffixes.... ,,

THE PREPOSITIONAL ADJECTIVE PHRASE.

An abridged form of the Adjective Clause..... 98
The Phrase is more expressive than the solitary noun..... ,,
Frequency and vagueness of the preposition 'of'..... ,,

THE POSSESSIVE AS AN ADJECTIVE.

Extensive process within limits..... 99
Analogy between the Possessive inflection and a significant suffix..... ,,

THE PARTICIPLE AS AN ADJECTIVE.

PAGE
At what point the Participle may be held to become an Adjective ... 99
The Participial Adjective usually expresses a permanent character ... ,,

THE ADJECTIVE IN CO-ORDINATION.

Adjectives applied to individuals do not limit ... 100
Neither do predicate adjectives; they add to the meaning of the subject ... ,,
Co-ordinating usage reconciled by ellipsis ... ,,
Co-ordinate relative clause abridged to predicate adjective, which is co-ordinating; examples ... ,,

LIMITATION TO AN INDIVIDUAL.

Successive narrowings of the class noun; the Superlative ... 101
Pronominal (demonstrative and possessive) adjectives ... 102
Noun and limitations incorporated in more general noun ... ,,

ADVERBS AS ADJECTIVES.

Adverbial meaning expressed in Adjective form ... 102

ADJECTIVES CLASSIFIED.

Adjectives of QUALITY—the largest and typical class ... 103
Adjectives of QUANTITY *in Number*: how far they have the typical characters ... ,,
Mr. Earle's view of the Numerals; further discussion ... 104
Construction of the Numerals; special licenses ... ,,
The Numerals represented—by figures or by words?—Collectives ... 105
Adjectives of QUANTITY *in Mass*: characteristic usage ... ,,
They measure roughly; contrast with the definite numerals ... 106
Special case of 'No, none' ... ,,
'No' is a Negative Adverb in Adjective form for a special convenience ... ,,
The negative adverb incompetent for *universal* denial ... ,,
Other modes; specially, the prefixing of 'no' to the subject ... ,,
'No' to be reserved for occasions of the highest emphasis ... 107
Further examples; strength of 'no' wasted on slight occasions ,,
The PRONOUN Adjectives: characteristics discussed ... 108
Couples for distinctive reference: 'That—this', and equivalents ,,
Advantages (comparative and absolute) of the couples; examples 109
'Former—latter' most used; frequently overdone ... ,,
Repetition of subjects is often the best course ... ,,
For easy cases, 'the one—the other' preferred ... 111
Then, 'first—second', 'first-named—second-named' ... ,,
Triple reference, by 'first—second—third', much too difficult. 112
Other reference adjectives enumerated ... ,,
Wide-spread ellipsis of noun ... 113

PAGE
The ARTICLES are Adjectives, in force as well as in origin..... 113
The *Indefinite* Article marks the Singular ..... ,,
Rarely omitted with common nouns ; omission to be explained ,,
Occasionally superseded ; cases enumerated..... ,,
Singular without Article often has a personifying effect..... 114
Article sometimes dropped in complements, and in appositions ,,
Omitted in common phrases, for shortness..... 115
The *Definite* Article a diluted 'that' ; usage..... ,,
A pointing word : points to relative clause or curtailed equivalent ..... ,,
It singles out individuals in a given collection..... ,,
Essential before some nouns limited by prepositional phrase ... ,,
Backward reference, as a softened 'that'..... 116
Individualizing force of the pronoun Adjectives kept up by 'the' ,,

THE VERB.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF VERBS.

The old definition may be a classification rather ; still faulty... 116
Classes of Verbs..... ,,

Transitive Verbs.

These express an action most simply and completely 117

Intransitive Verbs.

Various kinds of these reviewed..... 118
Cases corresponding to the classical Middle Voice..... ,,
The object being dropped, the verb (now Intransitive) expresses the action generally..... 119
Quiescent position sometimes given by Intransitive Verbs ..... ,,

Incomplete Verbs.

'Be' is the chief ; others remarked upon..... 120
Construction of double-object verbs..... ,,
Relation of Incomplete verbs to the other classes 121

Nouns operating as Verbs.

Verbs transmuted into nouns, while ceasing to predicate, may retain other functions..... 121
Object retained, as clause, infinitive, noun (with preposition) .. 122
Subject retained, in prepositional phrases and as a Possessive... 123
Adverbial adjuncts retained—with little (if any) change..... ,,
—as adjectives to the verbal nouns 124
Agent expressed in place of action : 'of' precedes object..... ,,
Motives for transforming verb into noun..... 125
Loss of simplicity : the change not to be rashly adopted..... ,,
More examples : how far may simpler forms be restored ?..... ,,

Adjectives as Verbs.

'Be' with an adjective may stand for a Verb (trans. or intrans.) 127
Adverbial qualification of adjectives treated..... ,,

PAGE
Verb influence at the root of the qualification..... 128
Loose employment of adjective for verb ..... ,,

THE ADVERB.

How best revealed: consider the action of the verb 128
Direction of the action: how expressed..... 129
Prepositions in Adverbial phrases extended to new meanings (as agency, time)..... ,,
Degree or intensity of action; *Excellence; Manner* or *Quality*.. 130
Transmutation of adjectives explained..... ,,
Many Adverbs are condensed clauses; hence their verb force... ,,
Adverbs are often converted verbs, through adjectives..... 131
The Adverb helps to incorporate two facts in one statement; advantages..... ,,
Making up of Adverbial Phrases 132

CLASSIFICATION OF ADVERBS.

Classes enumerated 132
The Classification justified in detail..... 133

I.—*Place and Direction.*

Reasons for making these a separate class..... 133

II.—*Time.*

Grounds for separate classification..... 133

III.—*Degree or Measure.*

Peculiar action of these; imitated by Adverbs of Quality..... 134

IV.—*Affirmation and Denial.*

The distinction important: how expressed..... 135
Negation under the guise of Affirmation..... 136

V.—*Manner or Quality.*

The great mass of Adverbs; not farther sub-divided..... 136
Cause given chiefly by phrases; might be classed apart..... ,,

THE PREPOSITION.

Classification not on grammatical grounds; its purpose and form 137
Prepositions originally assigned the *Direction* of action..... ,,
'Of' the most common and vague: usage discussed..... 138
'Of' now expresses object or end oftener than source (primary idea)..... 139
Indiscriminate use: cases. 'Of' might often be dropped..... 140

THE CONJUNCTION.

The classification a help to the meanings and uses..... 142
Special delicacies and liability to error. AND..... ,,
Presence and omission of 'and' variously significant..... 143
OR. Frequently vague and ambiguous..... 144
Used for 'and'. Verbal and real alternation..... ,,

PAGE
Inadequate to strong alternative contrasts ; 'or *else*'..... 145
'Or, nor, neither', dual words, extended to several alternatives ; 'nor *yet*'..... 146
BUT. A strong word ; wasted on unworthy occasions..... ,,
Substitutes of 'but' for these weaker oppositions 147
IF. Unnecessarily used where the condition is not prominent 148

INFLECTION.

THE GENDER OF NOUNS.

Principle of the Common Gender : Sex not stated, unless essential..... 149
Cases for distinct names for gender enumerated..... ,,
Feminine overdone ; should be disused when sex is immaterial 151

NUMBER OF NOUNS.

Number always expressed, however unimportant : an abuse.... 153
A Neutral or Common Number a felt want..... ,,
Statement of Number evaded, in various ways..... ,,
The plural form sometimes usefully significant.. 154
A Neutral or Common Form suggested 155
The typical plural (seen in science) a condensation of single independent statements..... ,,
Plurality and unity combined in the collective noun..... 156
Formal plurals with collective meaning..... ,,
Others name things that are pairs ; others, materials..... 157
Such exceptional plurals to be kept in the background..... 158

CASE.

Limitation of the Possessive 158
The Possessive is really another part of speech..... 159
The possessive meaning traced step by step, beginning from personal belongings..... ,,
Occasional inadequacy of the elliptical Possessive..... 161
Extreme applications ; verb construction preferable..... ,,
Ambiguities ; substitution by 'of'..... 162

CONJUGATION OF THE VERB.

The Inflections fragmentary : helps or substitutes..... 164
How far the inflections are useful, or superfluous..... ,,
TENSE and MOOD (Subjunctive) discussed..... ,,
The Passive VOICE : disadvantages and conveniences..... 165
PERSON a mere harmonic or echoing form ; rarely emphatic.... 166
NUMBER also an iteration ; sometimes strengthens the meaning 167
Minor Moods ; Imperative, Participle, Infinitive, Gerund..... ,,
Discrimination of forms in '-ing'..... 168

The Infinitive.

Characteristic uses detailed ; niceties..... 168

PAGE
Certain condensed transformations explained..... 169
Examples illustrating the usages of the Infinitive..... 170

The Participle.

Distinguishing marks enumerated..... 171
The Participle as a condensing power 172
Special delicacies :—Concurrent action expressed..... ,,
Participle condensed from adverbial clause..... ..... ,,
Infinitive lapses into participle—extended discussion.. 173
Latin and Greek constructions illustrative 176

The Verbal Noun in 'ing'.

Nice discrimination of Verbal Noun and Infinitive..... 177
The Verbal Noun marred by other forms in 'ing'..... ... 178

The Gerund.

The Infinitive form used to state purpose..... 178
Gerunds act as Adverbs or as Adjectives..... ..... ,,

THE AUXILIARY VERBS.

'Shall' and 'Will'.

The future wrongly given in old grammars..... 179
The two forms disentangled ; New Testament usage..... ,,
Distinctive uses exemplified in detail..... 180
'Shall' represents external influence on the subject..... ,,
'Will' means the native resolution of the subject.. ..... ,,
'Shall' expresses *eventuality*..... .... ,,
Special cases of 'Shall'..... 181
'Will' very nearly the same as the present indefinite tense..... 182
Interrogation governed by the same principles..... ,,
Interrogative forms where the will of the second person rules the action..... ,,
Interrogative forms for mere futurity 183

'Should' and 'Would'.

Contingent or Conditional futurity..... 185
Past Determination of the first person..... 186
Other controlling influences :—general cases ; fate..... ... 187
Past resolution of all subjects as to their own actions..... 188
Contingent Determination..... 189
The Future *Subjunctive* .... ,,
It puts all parties under outward control : exceptions.. 190
Special cases :—'Should' states *duty* for all subjects..... 191
'Should' and 'Would' as softened forms..... ,,
'Would' expresses past habit. 192
Interrogative use : no new principle.. ..... ,,
Miscellaneous examples of 'Should' and 'Would'..... 194

'May' and 'Can'.

How far auxiliary. Meanings contrasted..... 197

'*Must*'.

PAGE

Uninflected. Peculiar mode of expressing past time 198

THE SUBJUNCTIVE-MOOD.

Inflection fading: precarious existence 198
Condition expressed, with insinuation of doubt ..... ,,
'If' loosely used; conditionality stated variously 199
Contingent Futurity is the typical use; extensions ..... ,,
Inverted conditional form without conjunction 200
'Were' for 'should be', 'would be' 201
'Had' for 'should have', 'would have' ..... ,,
'Had better, as lief, &c.'; 'me were levere, &c.' 202

THE TENSES.

Present Tense (Indefinite)—expresses universal truth 203
Common mistake. How limited to present time solely ..... ,,

DERIVATION.

SOURCES OF THE VOCABULARY.

Practical intention of the review 205
Saxon and Classical words to be used, not indiscriminately, but in view of their special advantages ..... ,,
Propriety of the term 'Saxon' ..... ,,
Saxon words are more generally intelligible ..... ,,
They are widely associated with our strongest feelings 206
Classical words are valuable for precise discrimination ..... ,,
They are more refined and dignified 207
They predominate in elevated style; oratory, &c 208
Use Saxon words, unless special motives demand classical ..... ,,

Examples of the two Vocabularies.

Saxon words from various departments 208
Many French words widely diffused and very familiar 209
Classical words from various departments ..... ,,
Farther comparison of the distinctive merits of the two classes. 210
Familiar Saxon names needlessly ousted by classical names 211
A principle is stated in precise terms; the exposition admits less exact varieties 212
Saxon words more rarely supplant Classical words 213
The Saxon of the Bible ..... ,,
Authorized English translation compared with others 214
The classical element in the Bible 215
The language of the Bible might be still more simple 217
Learned terms in simple passages are inharmonious ..... ,,
Qualities of words not necessarily decided by their origin alone. 218
Some Saxon words difficult; many Classical words familiar ..... ,,
Classical words graduated in simplicity: Greek—Latin—French 219
Simplification of learned style: extended examples ..... ,,

COMPOSITION OF WORDS.

How far the process is to be examined here 229

PAGE
The chief gain is in brevity. Vocabulary largely increased..... 229
The important points of the subject..... ,,
Faults of Derivation..... 230

PREFIXES.

The Saxon Prefixes.

Enumeration and discussion..... 231
Practical end in view : importance of these prefixes..... 233

The Latin Prefixes.

Enumeration and discussion..... 234
Where the superior importance lies..... ,,

The Greek Prefixes,

Limited treatment ; reasons..... 243

SUFFIXES OR ENDINGS.

The Saxon Suffixes.

Enumeration in detail, and discussion..... 245

The Classical Suffixes.

Very numerous. Limits of the discussion..... 256

Summary of the Derivation of the Parts of Speech.

Mainly supplementary, and as regards the influence of Suffixes 271
Derivation of Nouns ; ends to be served..... ,,
Derivation of Adjectives ; leading purposes..... 273
Knowledge of the Derivative process detects malformations..... 277
Special instances examined : *-ed, -y*..... ,,

EXAMPLES OF DERIVATION.

Errors : misuse of prefixes and suffixes..... 278
Exercises in Derivation outlined..... 280

SYNTAX.

CONCORD.

Not an extensive process ; yet often superfluous..... 282
Practical purposes of the discussion..... ,,

CONCORD OF NUMBER.

The various cases..... 282
Nouns of Multitude, how construed..... 283
Plural verb or pronoun justified only by *real plurality* of Subject..... ,,
Niceties of Plural Concord : more examples with comments..... ,,
Concord of couples illustrated :
Combination of subjects with singular idea takes singular verb ; with distinct ideas, a plural verb..... 285
Unreal disjunction : 'or' for 'and'—an abuse..... ,,
How may the Plural Concord be best utilized ? Suggestions... 286

PAGE
Emphatic singularity demands singular forms 286
Emphatic plurality demands plural forms 287
Unimportant number to be served by neutral forms ..... ,,
False plurals: evasive constructions 288
Principles applied to selected passages 289

CONCORD OF GENDER.

Personal and impersonal subjects 291
'It' attenuated and enfeebled by extended use ..... ,,
Inadequate representative on high occasions ..... ,,
Enfeebling application of 'it' to large or dignified bodies 293
Alternative evasions ..... ,,

ORDER OF WORDS.

Importance of the subject 295

INVERSION OF SUBJECT AND VERB.

The main purpose is to gain emphasis 295
Adverb (and equivalents) in the foremost place: examples ..... ,,
Complement often first with adverbial force 297
Inversion without preceding adverb mostly poetical 298
Inversion of complement easy. Ambiguities ..... ,,
Infinitive (logical subject) anticipated by 'it', 'this', &c. (formal subject) comes after the predicate 299
Cases with 'it' absent, infinitive (subj.) still after verb ..... ,,
Similar instances of the noun clause 300

OBJECT AND VERB.

Ambiguity through inverted object 300
Inversion admissible when either subject or object is a pronoun ,,
Also when subject and object are not of the same number and the verb shows the number ..... ,,
No difficulty with the Imperative 301
Infinitive or clause (object) rather heavy for the first place ..... ,,
Practical purposes of the inversion ..... ,,

NOUN AND ADJECTIVE.

Propriety of the arrangement 302
Exceptions; for the most part poetical varieties ..... ,,
Adjectives with long or many adjuncts follow the noun 304
Most adjective equivalents, being more cumbrous, follow the noun; German usage compared ..... ,,
Noun repeated, so as to take complicated or important adjuncts in two divisions ..... ,,

The three first, or the first three?

Additional examples and explanation 305

The Article.

Rule of Repetition further exemplified 306
The Article precedes another adjective; exceptions 308
Rule of Repetition extended to Auxiliary verbs 309
And to Prepositions ..... ,,

PAGE
Special case of obverse couples 311
Conjunctions also are to be repeated..... ,,

PRONOUN AND ANTECEDENT.

Relative and Antecedent should be kept close..... 312
Subject and clause adjunct separated by predicate..... ,,
Devices for relief :—the relative resolved ; inversion..... ,,
A distant possessive Antecedent resolved..... 313
Awkward prominence of the relative..... 314

PLACING OF THE ADVERB.

All the delicacies of Order are brought up under this head..... 315
Law of PROXIMITY : Adverb may come before or after verb. ... ,,
Adverb placed after, especially at the end of the clause..... ,,
Adjuncts, when numerous, cluster before and after the verb... ,,
Law of PRIORITY : grounding considerations..... 316
The Qualification comes first ; we prefer to look forward... ,,
The Qualification influences all up to a break..... ,,

Special instances of single-word Adverbs.

Misplacement of ONLY. Alternative forms..... 316
'Only' referred to a preceding subject : similar case of 'first' 318
NOT. Examples with criticisms..... 319
Miscellaneous examples : misplacement of 'more', 'never', 'but', 'even', 'enough' (refers back), 'at least'..... 320

Placing of Adverbs generally.

Examples criticized. Re-arrangements and various forms..... 321
Unnatural separations : an Adverb should not separate the object from its adjunct, especially if the adjunct be a relative clause..... 322
When a short adverbial adjunct and a long or emphatic object come together, the adverb should stand first..... 323
Important adverbial adjuncts first—a powerful inversion..... ,,
Emphatic prominence of 'not', 'never'..... 324
The most sweeping adverbial adjunct takes the foreground..... ,,
Adverb comes first for closeness to previous statement..... 325
Proper order : time—place—manner ; exceptions..... ,,

PLACING OF PREPOSITIONS.

Prepositions precede their object..... 326
Relative clauses often throw the preposition to the end..... ,,
Interrogatives take the first place ; preposition again at the end ,,

PLACING OF CONJUNCTIONS.

Frequent misplacement of 'not—but', 'not only—but also'... 326
Alternative forms..... 327
Improprieties incidental to the double conjunctions..... ,,
'Neither—nor', 'not—or', often misplaced..... 328

PLACING OF ADJUNCTS GENERALLY.

General examples of Adjectives and Adverbs (and their equivalents) criticized at full length..... 328

INTRODUCTION.

THE DEFINITIONS IN GRAMMAR.

ANY subject that has to deal with a large mass of complicated and wayward facts, such as the usages of a modern cultivated language, would need, for its own sake, to have all its classes well marked and defined. Still more would this be demanded, if the subject is also to be put forward as an instrument of mental training.

In Grammar, the operation of defining is required mainly for the Parts of Speech. For although we might be expected at the outset to define the scope or province of the subject itself, we are precluded from doing so by the neglect of Grammarians to observe a clear line of distinction between Grammar and the allied departments—Philology on the one hand, and Rhetoric on the other. Thus—to compare Grammar with Rhetoric and the higher elements of Composition—while there are well-marked differences in the extremes of the two subjects, as for example the contrast between the Inflexion of Words or the rules of Concord in Syntax on the one hand, and the Figures of Speech or the laws of Description on the other, there are matters treated indifferently in both departments; such as the placing of qualifying words and the disposition of the clauses in a sentence. In a practical subject like Grammar, we do not gain much by drawing a severe boundary line; the thing to be most considered is at what points, or in what connexions, an important rule can be most effectively taught.

The defining of the Parts of Speech is a serious affair. The whole fabric of Grammar rests upon the classifying of words according to their function in the sentence. A loose

definition of a class necessarily fails to meet the instances that arise; consequently, easy cases alone are noticed, difficulties are slurred over, distinctions are confounded, in short, where explanation is most wanted, it is not forthcoming.

DEFINITION OF THE NOUN.

The various forms of defining the Noun reduce themselves essentially to two ways of looking at it. One is founded on *meaning*, or the things or objects denoted by it; the other on its place or *office* in the sentence, regardless of what it may signify or express. The first I hold to be in principle erroneous; the second I consider the only right mode.

I. The form that we have been most accustomed to is this: 'A Noun is the name of any person, place, or thing. Slight amendments have been introduced as follows:—'Nouns are the names of persons, places, animals, or things'; 'the name of a person, place, or thing, or anything perceived or imagined'. A more recent form casts out the specification of 'person, place, &c.', and puts stress simply upon 'naming.' 'The noun names'; 'is the name of something'.

All these ways of defining are open to the gravest objections.

(1.) If we take the commoner form, 'person, place, or thing', we discern a feeble and abortive attempt to classify the objects of human knowledge. 'Persons' afford a pretty distinct class; so do 'places'; but what are we to make of 'things'? This is the vaguest word in the language, and, before being employed in defining another word, should itself be defined. When used comprehensively in logical or metaphysical discussions, it includes places, and even persons. In the narrower popular signification, it would express mountains, seas, roads, towns, and many other significations encroaching upon places. It would hardly be applied to the feelings and qualities of the mind, such as conscience, love, virtue; and yet these are neither persons, nor places, nor animals.

The additional words 'anything perceived or imagined' would seem intended either to supplement the word 'things', or to explain and unfold its meaning, or perhaps both. In none of the suppositions is the amendment satisfactory. The words are so wide that they cover all the previous particulars, 'person, place, thing'; so that there is palpable redundancy. Further, the author of the definition would seem to have in view only the things of the outer world; for 'perceived' is unsuitable to states of the mind; and 'imagined', as following on 'perceived', scarcely supplies the defect. There should have been the additional word 'felt'; 'perceived, felt, or imagined'.

(2.) Discarding the attempt to define by subdividing and classifying the meanings of the noun, we come to the much safer form, 'The Noun *names*.' In this expression there is truth, but not the exact truth in question. If the specific mark of the noun, distinguishing it from every other part of speech, be to name, then the other parts of speech do not name; they are not names. But if these are not names, what are they? Are the adjectives 'just,' 'old,' names of nothing? They certainly have some share in naming; if 'man' is a name, 'just man' is also a name, a compound or two-worded name.

Besides this, we know well that because a word names something, it is not necessarily a noun. 'Give me *water*, that I may *water* the flowers.' Here 'water' is the name of something; so far as that goes it is a noun; but whoever understands the grammar of the sentence knows that, while the first 'water' is a noun, the second is a verb. 'Waste will cause want' contains four words, each one of which is is noun or verb (without change of meaning) according to the form of the sentence.

Those Grammarians that give, as the definition of the Verb, 'asserting', 'stating', or 'declaring' something, could get out of the difficulty by saying that the noun *names*, but does not *assert*; an asserting word is not a noun. In 'I *water* the flowers', the word 'water' asserts what I do; it is here a verb, although more usually a noun. But this con-

sideration introduces us to the second, and the only allowable mode of defining the noun.

II. The form, 'The noun names', may be regarded as a hesitating approach to the definition by function or office in the sentence. So also, 'the name of anything that we speak about'; this suggests but does not fully express that the noun is the Subject of the sentence. A still more curious example of the wavering definition is as follows:—'A noun is the name of any person, place, thing, quality, or principle; or *more generally*, it is the name of whatever can be an object of contemplation or *subject of discourse*'. The first half is the old definition by meanings; the second half, given as being 'more general', is really a departure from the old method, and the adoption of the new, which, however, ought to stand alone, wholly excluding the other, instead of including it, or alternating with it.

According to Sir John Stoddart (art. 'Philosophy of Language,' Encyclopædia Metropolitana), 'A word is called a *Noun* when in a simple sentence it serves merely to name a conception, and not to assert anything concerning it.' In reviewing the same work, Dean Mansel says, 'The characteristic of a noun substantive, or of its substitute, the personal pronoun, is that it can be the subject of an assertion.' Among recent Grammarians, Dr. Latham takes the same view.

The recent addition to Grammar—The Analysis of Sentences—conducts directly to this way of regarding the noun. The Sentence is divided into subject and predicate; if a sentence has but two words—'earth trembled',—the subject word 'earth' is a Noun, the predicate word 'trembled' is a Verb. We come to this decision without considering what the words express; it is of no consequence whether the subject word represent a person, a place, or a thing in general; the fact that it stands as the subject of the sentence makes it (with some restrictions) a noun, and not a verb, an adjective, or an adverb.

It is truly remarked by Dean Mansel that the subject of the sentence may be also a Pronoun; so that in order to

define the noun, we must exclude the Pronoun. This is done by the second part of the Definition in the Grammar—'The Noun is the name of the thing itself, while the Pronoun names by means of a reference.' There are various ways of expressing the restriction. Dr. Latham calls the Noun 'an *invariable* name', the Pronoun '*variable*'. Another expression for the contrast is *notional* and *relational*, which roughly divides the Parts of Speech into Nouns, Adjectives, Verbs, and Adverbs, on the one hand, and Pronouns, Prepositions, and Conjunctions, on the other. Mr. Earle uses the designations *Presentive* and *Symbolic* for what is in the main the same distinction.

It is not enough, however, to say that the Noun is the *subject* of a sentence. Equally characteristic is its use as the *object* of a transitive verb; and for this position, there is the same equivalent—the Pronoun. The noun occurs in other connexions; the most frequent being the Phrase made up of preposition and noun. But this is not a testing situation; to test the noun we must *suppose* it subject or object of a sentence, and see that it is not a pronoun.

But the separating of the Pronoun does not complete the definition of the Noun. There are cases where the subject of a sentence is neither Noun nor Pronoun: '*to rule* gives dignity', '*serving* may be our duty'. The expressions, 'to rule', 'serving', are called Infinitives; they are an offshoot of the verb, wherein it lays aside the predicating or asserting function, and takes on the form of the noun, so as to become the subject of the sentence. Before, therefore, pronouncing the subject of a sentence to be a Noun, we must first make sure that it is not an infinitive; and next ascertain that it is not a pronoun. The tests are given in the Grammar.

DEFINITION OF THE PRONOUN.

Almost universally, grammarians define the Pronoun as 'A substitute for the Noun'. The explanation is occasionally added, 'to save the too frequent repetition of Nouns'. Dr. Latham's definition is this: 'A variable name capable of forming, by itself, either the subject or the predicate of

a Proposition'; and by 'variable' he means that the pronoun may assume different meanings in different situations.

On this definition, I submit a few observations. When 'substituting' a noun is spoken of, we naturally ask, why should a noun have or need a substitute? and we are informed that the repetition of nouns may become tedious or tiresome to the ear. We ask farther, is this the case with other parts of speech? Are the Adjective, Verb, and Adverb likewise provided with substitutes when their repetition would tire us?

But, in the next place, it is not true that Pronouns always stand as substitutes for nouns. They frequently take the place of *infinitives* and *clauses;* the demonstratives 'it, this, that', and the relative 'which', are so used. The objection might doubtless be got over, by understanding a noun or its equivalents—the infinitive and the noun clause. More fatal is the difficulty caused by Interrogatives, which represent something as yet unknown. If we knew the subject referred to, we should prefer to name it by its own name; we use the interrogative to show that we wish to be informed of some person or thing that we are ignorant of.

Again, as regards Personal pronouns. 'I' expresses much more than a name would express; it signifies that the person so named is *in the act of speaking to,* or addressing, some other person or persons. This is the fact intimated by the word 'I', and it is not intimated by the Proper Noun for the person. The same applies to 'they', or 'you'. When a speaker addresses a large audience he is wholly indifferent to their real names; it does not serve his purpose to employ these. He regards the audience solely as for the time listening to him; and that fact is precisely expressed by 'you', and would not be expressed by their real names, even if he were to take the trouble to repeat these. There are synonyms for the pronouns in this capacity, as 'my hearers', 'my listeners', 'my friends'; but these are not the names of the individuals. A speaker in the first person sometimes, instead of 'I', says 'the humble individual now addressing you'.

So far as concerns not repeating a noun, the pronoun is not the sole device resorted to. For the proper name of a person, we often use a more general designation applicable to the person: for 'Pitt', we may substitute 'the minister,' 'the orator,' 'the statesman'.

There is an inverted operation of substituting a noun for a Pronoun, as in addressing persons in high office or rank, 'your Majesty,' 'your Excellency'. But, in addition to the pronominal force, these expressions indicate in most cases the rank or position of the individuals addressed. The meaning of the pronoun is fully given, with a qualifying circumstance in addition.

The study of what is called 'Universal Grammar and Philology', has shown that pronouns are among the earliest parts of speech; they are as old as the oldest nouns or verbs. They were not invented at that stage of language when people began to feel the wearisomeness of repeating a proper name; they existed when such fastidiousness of ear was neither experienced nor indulged. The occasion of their being invented was the great frequency of the situation wherein two or more human beings came together, the one speaking the others listening, while some third person, persons, or things, might be the subject of discourse. To give *ex officio* designations to persons when occupying one or other of these three positions was a very early necessity of speech, or at least a very apparent convenience. The words for the personal pronouns are shown to be a primitive class; they are derived from certain simple and elementary syllables, also used to make the personal inflections of the verb; they may also have been the first form of the numerals, one, two, three. They were, in fact, simply demonstrative particles, indicating palpable relations of space or position (this or here, that or there, what or where).

For these reasons, Pronouns were defined by Dr. Findlater (English Grammar, Chambers's Information for the People) as 'symbols, names, or highly-generalized marks, applied to objects to signify, not any inherent attribute,

but merely *their relation to the act of speaking*'. They are, therefore, *relational* names.

DEFINITION OF THE ADJECTIVE.

The old and familiar definition of the Adjective is—'the word expressing the quality of a noun'. Varied thus:—'the kind or quality of a noun'; 'to qualify a noun, or distinguish it from others of the same name'; 'used with a noun to denote some quality, attribute, or fact, which we connect in thought with that for which the noun stands, so that the adjective and noun together form a compound description' (Mason).

It would take a good deal of explanation to make a beginner understand what is meant by a *quality*; to the apprehension of children, Quality is on a level with Quiddity and Nonentity. Evidently the meaning is very little present to the minds of either the young or the old; for while the definition states that *all* adjectives express *quality*, the classification of them under *Quantity* and Quality, implies that *some* do not signify a quality.

Dr. Latham, who excels in the Logic of Grammar, says—'A word capable, by itself, of forming the Predicate, but not capable of forming the subject of a Proposition, is called an Adjective'. This is an important circumstance respecting the Adjective, but is not well suited for a definition. He goes on: 'An Adjective shows that the substantive with which it is united possesses a certain quality'.

The first fact to be stated respecting the Adjective is that it is the adjunct of the noun, as the adverb is of the verb. The next fact is that the adjective and the noun together make but one meaning, and that meaning different from the meaning of the noun alone: 'tall man', although two words, has only one meaning, and that is different from the meaning of 'man' by itself. The Adjective alone has not a complete meaning: 'tall' needs us to suppose something to apply it to—man, tree, pillar.

The point is, to say exactly and intelligibly what change the adjective makes in the noun that it accompanies. Now,

it is to *common* or *class* nouns that adjectives are applied—man, horse, tree; and when we look at the meaning of the combination of adjective and class noun, we see that a class is still named, but *a smaller class;* 'tall men' is a smaller class than 'men'; 'black horse' is a smaller class than 'horse'; 'old trees' are fewer in number than 'trees'.

Moreover, this narrowing of the class is accompanied with *increase in the class peculiarities* or distinctions. The peculiarities of the class 'man' are all found in the smaller class 'tall man', with the peculiarity of being tall superadded; tall men are not the whole of men, but a distinguished selection of men, and the distinguishing feature is signified by the adjective 'tall'.

In Natural History, it is usual to express objects by two names, one called the *generic* name—a noun, the other the *specific* or specifying name—an adjective or something serving the same purpose: red rose, white rose; 'rose', genus or larger class; 'red', specifying adjunct to select from the class 'rose' the smaller class 'red rose'. 'Rose' contains red roses, white roses, and many other sorts; any one select sort is discriminated by the specifying terms, 'red', 'white', &c.

Thus the definition of the Adjective is 'a word united to a class noun to narrow its range, and increase its meaning': *bright* colours, *square* table, *first* rank, *our* streets, *beautiful* women.

This definition is as intelligible as the case admits of. For the very abstract term 'quality', I substitute the terms 'peculiarity', 'distinction', 'distinguishing feature', 'increase of meaning', which seem to me more suggestive of a definite idea. The pupil must be able to comprehend the difference between a class and a selection from a class; which is to comprehend what is implied in *genus* and *species*.

Dr. Latham's principle follows from this definition. An adjective, though it may be a predicate, cannot be a subject; 'tall' by itself is not a subject; it is a limiting word, and must have some other word to limit. As a predicate—'John is *tall*',—it is employed to limit the unexpressed class

'man', to which John is affirmed to belong. But given as a subject without any other word, it would have nothing to limit: 'tall is excellent' is devoid of meaning; 'tall *men* are powerful' has a meaning; and so has '*tallness* is excellent', the adjective being turned into a noun (abstract).

So much for the Definition of the Adjective. In applying it to adjectives in detail, there are serious difficulties, which it will be our business to cope with. These are considered under the PARTS OF SPEECH (Adjective).

DEFINITION OF THE VERB.

The verb is so pointedly and exclusively the Predicate word, that its definition should be free from dispute. We cannot assert or deny without a finite verb; we cannot use a verb without making an assertion or a denial (allowance being made for Imperatives and Interrogatives).

It is a property of the verb to undergo changes for Time, Person, Number, &c., and by this it is marked no less than by predication. But in our language, these changes are so few, that they would often fail us in distinguishing a verb from a noun; the forms 'lovest,' 'loved,' are certainly verbs, 'love' may be either a verb or a noun.

Among its many modifications, the verb has forms that serve as Nouns (the infinitives), and forms that serve as Adjectives (the participles). Such words do not constitute predicates, and they have, therefore, to be excepted from the definition. What is termed the 'finite' verb leaves these out of account, and comprises only the predicating parts of the verb.

It is no objection to the defining by predication, that the verb often needs some other word, a noun or an adjective, joined with it to complete a predicate: 'he is a *soldier*,' 'I bought *a horse*'. The 'is' and the 'bought' are the asserting words, because they are of the kind that can never be dispensed with; whether they are, or are not, sufficient in a given case, is an accident of the meaning to be conveyed. Whatever other part of speech the predicate may contain, it must

have a verb; whereas the verb does not occur except in the predicate.

The old definition of the verb, still maintained in some Grammars, is faulty in the extreme. The verb is said to express 'being, doing, or suffering'. A slightly varied, but still more objectionable, form is that it denotes 'what we do, think, or suffer'. Again: 'A verb tells what anything does, or what is done to it, or what state it is in'.

Now, in the first place, this definition does not separate the Verb from the Noun. We have nouns to express all the modes of being, doing, and suffering; 'existence' is being; 'motion, action, impulsion' are modes of doing, 'pain, agony, remorse, distress, discomfort', are modes of suffering.

In the next place, there are verbs that do not express being, doing, thinking, or suffering. The verbs 'have', 'may', 'can' are in point. 'I can' expresses not what I do, but what I am able to do; action in *potentiality*, as it is called. To include these verbs, the 'doing' would have to be amended to 'doing, actual or potential'.

Third, it appears a strange caprice that we should have a class of verbs for 'suffering', and none for being pleased or enjoying ourselves. As this is not either being or doing, it would have to come under suffering! The reason no doubt is that 'suffer' is intended to mean all modes of receiving impressions, or, as it is correctly expressed, being 'acted on'.

Fourth, there is no grammatical reason for inculcating such an abstruse distinction as these words imply. It matters not what a verb means, or what classes of general ideas verbs express; this is considered in Logic and Metaphysics, but is useless and intolerable in Grammar. In point of fact, however, the test is not really applied in teaching; pupils discover which are the verbs by some other means, and merely parrot the definition when asked. Probably no teacher ever required a pupil to apply the definition to 'may' and 'can'.*

* The following is a fifth consideration, although somewhat more abstruse. It is only in very peculiar instances that we define by *classifying*: defining is a prior and distinct process; classifying succeeds and is ruled by different

The only justification for such inadequate, impotent, and irrelevant definitions was the want of the clue furnished by the Analysis of the Sentence. Many grammarians have adopted the new method. We have such forms as 'A verb asserts something of its subject'; 'A verb is a word by which we state something'; 'A verb is a word that *affirms* something of its nominative' (Lennie's Grammar, small type definition).

DEFINITION OF THE ADVERB.

Grammarians have agreed to define the Adverb as qualifying the verb. It is to the verb what the adjective is to the noun. There is, however, the additional circumstance that it may also qualify an Adjective, or another Adverb. The only one of the notional parts of speech that it may not qualify is the Noun; so that a clear line is drawn between it and the Adjective.

Take a few specimens of the manner of wording the definition:—'An Adverb expresses some quality or circumstance'; 'modifies the meaning of a verb, an adjective, or another adverb'; 'expresses the conditions of time, place, manner, degree, cause, effect, under which an event or attribute may be viewed'; 'expresses when, where, or in what manner anything is done'.

As a definition, the best form is the simple statement—an adverb modifies or limits a verb. We must, however, by a verb understand the predicate of a sentence. A copula or incomplete verb by itself is not qualified by an adverb; when we say 'that is *scarcely* fair', we must regard 'scarcely' as modifying the predicate 'is fair'. So when an adverb is used with a transitive verb completed by an object,—'the prospect *greatly* charmed us',—the adverb modifies the complete predicate 'charmed us'.

The definitions that condescend upon the modes of adverb

motives. A triangle is first defined as a right-lined plane figure having three sides: the class 'triangles' so marked out are then divided into the subclasses—right-angled, &c. A mammal, a bird, or a fish, are each defined, before being subdivided into classes: the subdivision would not stand in place of the definition.

qualification—time, place, degree, manner, cause, &c.,—err in giving a division either in place of the definition, or along with it to help it out. Dividing or classifying adverbs is a separate and subsequent operation. This is the error committed in the prevailing definitions of the noun and the verb, although not in the other parts of speech. To ascertain the grammatical classes of adverbs, the classes marked out, on reasons of grammar, demands special consideration.

I do not enquire at present under what circumstances Adverbs may qualify Adjectives and other Adverbs.

THE PREPOSITION.

The Preposition is defined 'a word showing the relation of two other words in the same sentence'. An improvement upon this vague expression is 'a word placed *before a noun or pronoun* to show its relation to some other word of the sentence'. Dr. Latham defines it as a word that will combine only with Substantives and Pronouns.

Vossius defines the preposition 'as a word whereby a noun *is joined to a verb*' (vox per quam adjungitur *verbo* nomen, locum, tempus, aut causam significans, seu positivè seu privativè); while Dr. Wm. Smith defines it, in the first instance, as 'a word showing the relation of one *noun* to another'.

Sir John Stoddart gives an alternative—the relation of a substantive either to another substantive or to a verb. Dr. Mansel (criticizing Stoddart) is more precise:—'A preposition is a part of speech annexed to a noun or verb in a proposition, and serving to connect it with a noun or pronoun, by which it is limited as the subject or predicate of that proposition'; in other words it bears a part in making up a *qualifying phrase*.

The difficulty lies in drawing a line between prepositions and conjunctions. Conjunctions can, and often do, express a relation between two words in the same sentence:—'you *and* I will go together'; 'the tides are caused by the sun *and* the moon'; 'I waited an hour *or* two'.

Dr. Latham's definition—'words that will combine *only* with nouns and pronouns',—if it were strictly true, would

make a distinction; for although 'conjunctions will combine with nouns and pronouns',—'you will find him *and* me *and* Baker'—still, conjunctions will unite verbs too—'strike *but* hear'. Yet looking at the infinitive mood of the verb, '*to live*', 'debarred *from writing*', we are not entitled to affirm that a preposition cannot be joined to a verb, unless we call the infinitive the noun form of the verb (which is the fact), and say that a preposition cannot be joined to a *finite verb*, as '*to* is', '*from* came'. With this allowance, Dr. Latham's definition keeps separate the preposition and the conjunction. So if the expression given by Vossius were correct—joining a noun to a verb—this too would be a clear line between the preposition and the conjunction. The conjunction may connect a verb with a verb, and a noun with a noun, but never connects a verb with a noun: we could not say—'I went *and* the town'. Amid all the irregularities of our grammar, this is a combination that cannot be instanced. Now, although it is not true that the preposition is limited to the connecting of nouns with verbs, yet we may judge of a preposition by thinking whether it *could* connect a noun and a verb, 'I went *to* the country'.

Equally pertinent is the circumstance implied, although not very explicitly stated, in Mansel's definition, that a preposition combines with a noun to qualify the predicate, or to make an adverbial adjunct or phrase: 'we came *by degrees*'. A conjunction is not capable of occupying this place,—'we came *if* degrees'. This is in substance the remark just made.

We may arrive at the characteristic of the preposition by adverting to the primary qualifying circumstance of movements, viz., Direction. The pronoun roots, which are also the leading prepositions, originally meant direction, and, through that, position in place; 'go *to*', 'bring *from*', put *in*'. Such words standing alone are treated as adverbs; but they seldom do stand alone. To show direction, we have to state a landmark or terminus, which is named by some noun; the two together making a definite phrase of direction—'go *to town*', 'speak *to John*'. A preposition is in its element when uniting a verb with a noun, so as to show the

course of the action, or the outgoing of the movement or exertion indicated by the verb. A word that cannot play this part *is not* a preposition; a word that can do this, *is* a preposition.

It is the fact, however, that prepositions may connect one noun with another noun: 'he went from town *to* country', 'the house *in* the wood', 'a bottle *of* wine', 'the command *of* the army', 'guesses *at* truth'. Such cases may generally be explained by some tacit verb, or some equivalent of a verb. In the first instance, 'he went *from* town *to* country', the second phrase, '*to* country' in reality qualifies the verb 'went' although in juxtaposition with 'town.' 'The house *in* the wood' is elliptical; the phrase qualifies a verb understood, 'situated.' 'A bottle *of* wine' is a bottle 'filled with wine'; 'the command *of* the army' is 'commanding the army'; the verbal noun 'command' being attended with an adverbial phrase, as if a verb: the same may be said of 'guesses *at* truth'. In almost every case, it is possible to point out a verb at the bottom of the combination of preposition and noun, constituting it an adverbial phrase.

It is also the fact that a preposition may lie between an adjective and a noun: 'agreeable *to* your views', 'oblivious *to* consequences', 'far *from* righteousness', 'equal *to* the best', 'strong *in* body,' 'glorious *in* his apparel'. In the two first examples, the adjectives may be regarded as the equivalents of verbs, and like verbs to be qualified by adverbial phrases. 'Equal to' is a case considered under the Adjective. Certain adjectives are incomplete in sense without some phrase of reference, 'equal *to nine*', 'superior *to his master*'. So when we say 'he was strong *in body*', we limit the adjective 'strong' by the phrase 'in body'; the meaning is otherwise and more naturally expressed by 'his body was strong'; 'his apparel was glorious'.

The foregoing considerations appear to justify us in defining the Preposition 'a word prefixed to a Noun or Pronoun (or equivalent) to make a qualifying or adverbial phrase'.

THE CONJUNCTION.

The Conjunction is said to connect sentences, parts of sentences, and words. The concluding circumstance—the connecting of words—is what obscures the boundary between the preposition and the conjunction. Indeed so vague a description may mean almost anything.

If we could limit the conjunction to the connecting of *sentences*, the distinction between it and the preposition would be broad and clear. In point of fact, however, conjunctions often unite one noun to another noun, as happens also with prepositions—'I saw John *and* James'; 'send for John *or* James'.

Such examples are well known to be contracted forms, giving the meaning of two sentences in one; 'I saw John, and I saw James', 'send for John, or send for James'. So far as these are concerned, the definition might still be kept up with the qualification, or explanation, that when two or more sentences are united into one, by omitting facts common to both, the remaining members are coupled by the same words as the full sentences or clauses.

This does not meet the case where a conjunction is employed to connect words indicating the different parts of one operation; 'James and John carried the basket (between them)'; 'two *and* three is five'; the 'wheel *and* axle is a mechanic power'; 'let AB, *and* BC, *and* CA, make up a triangle'. None of these could be readily resolved into independent sentences or clauses; we could not say 'two is five and three is five'. If there be an ellipsis or contraction, it is much more disguised, and its resolution more circuitous. We could expand such forms in this way:—'Take the line AB, *and* take the line BC, *and* take the line AC, *and* they will make up the triangle ABC'; 'take three *and* take two, *and* add them, *and* their sum is five'.

So far as I am aware, this case of collective action is the only obstacle to defining the conjunction as the connective of sentences or their contracted equivalents. But such an exception, even if it cannot be reconciled by the device above suggested, is too insignificant to interfere with the

broad and characteristic use of the conjunction. The pupils should be taught to see in the presence of a conjunction the coupling of affirmations; and although these may be united in one clause, they are still to be treated as distinguishable facts.

The restricting of the conjunction to affirmations effectually separates it from the preposition. For although a few prepositions, such as 'for', 'before', 'after', 'since', connect clauses, they are held, in so doing, to be conjunctions and not prepositions; it being a familiar fact in grammar, that the same word may play two different parts.

THE USE OF THE DEFINITIONS IN TEACHING.

An English teacher once observed to me that the pupils, in singling out proper Nouns, follow the clue of the capital letter. The observation may be made more general. For all the Parts of Speech, some mark is hit upon quite apart from the definition. As regards Pronouns, Prepositions, and Conjunctions, the fewness of their number allows of their being soon known individually. Then for the Adverbs, the ending in 'ly' is a test that answers with the vast majority. The Verb is known by its forms of conjugation. The Adjective is scented out by meaning, by position, and by the use of comparison. The Abstract Noun, the most abstruse of all words, is soon known by the prevalent ending 'ness'; the teacher does not expect a young pupil to know the others.

All this, however, is not teaching, but evasion or subterfuge, whether conscious or unconscious on the part of the teacher. If a definition is taught, it should be understood and acted on when occasion offers. The teacher should, in suitable instances, ask *why* a word, stated by the pupil to be a preposition, *is* a preposition and *not* a conjunction, an adverb, or any other part of speech. Should this exercise go beyond the ability of the pupils, they have entered on grammar too soon. The Parts of Speech are at the foundation of all the rules of grammar; the meaning of each Part of Speech is given in its definition, and if the definitions are not understood, everything is chaotic.

INFLEXION.

Should INFLEXION be taught along with the Parts of Speech, or under a separate head?

On the one side, there seems to be a suitableness in giving, under the Noun, not only its definition and divisions, but also its Declension and changes for Gender. Likewise with the Adjective; the Comparison of adjectives would appear to follow naturally in the account of the adjective as a Part of Speech. And the same for the other inflected Parts of Speech—Pronoun, Verb, Adverb. Accordingly, the greater number of grammarians proceed upon this plan.

On the other side, it may be contended that the operations of defining and classifying are distinct, important, and difficult; and that there is a propriety in going through these operations for all the parts of speech, before beginning the peculiar process of Inflexion. Any one may notice that the treatment of the Parts of Speech themselves (defining and classifying) is not usually so full and thorough in the grammars that take Inflexion along with definition and classification, as in those that separate the two heads.

In the same way, the operations placed under Inflexion, are distinct and important; and, unless exhibited apart, they can scarcely obtain the prominence they deserve. Moreover, Declension is common to the Noun and the Pronoun; the discussion of case, and of number, therefore, applies equally to both: while to Conjugate the Verb is a vast process, not necessarily connected with the defining and the classifying of verbs. It concerns both the perspicuity and the elegance of style to discriminate precisely the meanings of the cases of the Noun and Pronoun, and the tenses of the Verb. Even the limited subject—Gender—admits of niceties of handling.

If under the head 'Noun', we are to exhaust everything relating to Nouns, we should be led into Syntax also; yet the rules of Syntax have never been mixed up with the Parts of Speech.

DERIVATION.

A very full discussion is given to this department, under the two heads—Sources of Vocabulary and Composition of Words. The purpose is partly to make the information more complete than in the Grammar, and partly to show how the subjects can be rendered interesting to the pupils, and useful as a means of improving them in English Composition.

SYNTAX.

I have already expressed my sense of the great value of the Analysis of Sentences. I consider, however, that additional examples are here uncalled for. Indeed, I am not sure that too much is not made of the formal scheme of Analysing Sentences. Not only is it not the main part of Syntax, but it is apt to disguise what appears to me the main part—the Order of Words. After we have thrown the different parts of a sentence into the form prescribed, we have still to go back and consider how the sentence stands originally, and whether the words, phrases, and clauses, are so disposed to each other as to give the meaning with sufficient clearness. It is to this that I have devoted the larger portion of the examples and illustrations given under SYNTAX.

PARTS OF SPEECH.

THE NOUN.

ENOUGH was said in the Introduction respecting the different modes of defining the Noun. Reasons were given for the threefold definition in the Grammar, which is believed to be fully adequate to distinguish the noun from other parts of speech. The examples now to be given will show the manner of applying the definition.

CLASSIFICATION OF NOUNS.

In classifying or subdividing any part of speech, the first question to ask is—what grammatical purpose is to be served by the classification? The common definition of the Noun—the name of a person, place, or thing—is, I have said, not a definition at all; if it be any thing, it is a classification or subdivision of nouns into names of places, names of persons, and names of things. As regards the two last classes—persons and things,—there are occasions when the distinction is grammatically important; as in the use of pronouns, and in the designations for gender. The distinction between place and thing never determines any grammatical construction.

But in actually classifying Nouns, grammarians do not introduce any of these distinctions, but proceed on a totally different plan. The classes given have varied in number from three to five; while all are agreed upon three of them. The oldest and most familiar classification is—Proper, Common, and Abstract. The two additional classes, recently added, are Collective and Material.

Each of these classes has some grammatical peculiarity.

According to class, there may be variety of usage in one or more of three things:—first, the Plural Number; second, the use of the Articles; third, the Plural Concord, in Syntax.

The PROPER, Singular, or Meaningless Noun, is by its nature the name of one thing: 'Noah', 'Lebanon', 'Mississippi'. It cannot take a plural, and it is used without the indefinite article; neither can it have the definite article. When it seems to have the plural or an article, there is some departure from the usual modes of speaking.

The COMMON, General, Significant Noun, is the name for a number of objects: 'father', 'mountain', 'river'. Sometimes only one of these is spoken of, at other times several. There are distinct grammatical usages for the two cases: in the first case, the noun is singular, with the indefinite article prefixed, 'a father'; in the second, the noun is plural, without the article, 'fathers'.

The ABSTRACT Noun is a very remarkable kind of noun; differing in grammatical usage from the Common or General Noun, and yet not agreeing with the Proper Noun. Examples—'darkness', 'fulness', 'motion'. As expressing a single circumstance, the abstract noun cannot be plural, except by ceasing to be abstract; we do not say 'darknesses'. It is not preceded by the indefinite article—'a darkness'—unless where some word is left out—'a (kind of) coolness'.

It is grammatically important to divide Abstract Nouns into *Adjective* Abstract, and *Verb* Abstract. The Adjective abstracts are formed from adjectives: they include the nouns made up by affixing 'ness' to adjectives—'whiteness', 'roundness', 'plainness'; and nouns in 'ty', such as 'veracity', 'validity', 'honesty', 'stupidity'; also nouns in 'nce', as 'temperance', 'patience', 'forbearance', 'reticence'. The Verb abstracts are verbal nouns, or nouns formed from verbs and expressing the action of the verb—'occupation', 'contradiction', 'division', 'belief', 'proof', 'death'.

The Noun of MATERIAL has peculiarities similar to the Abstract Noun. It cannot become plural, and it does not take the indefinite article; we do not say 'golds', 'a gold'. As in the case of the abstract noun there are apparent

exceptions: 'sands', 'clays', 'coals', 'irons', 'leads', 'coppers', 'an earth', 'a water'. But in such instances the meaning is changed; instead of expressing the entire aggregate of the material, they signify portions of it, or things made of it, or kinds of it. They become common, general, or class names; being parsed accordingly.

Thus, although the Proper, the Abstract, and the Material Noun signify very different things, they agree grammatically among themselves, and differ from the Common Noun. They take neither the plural form nor the indefinite article.

The COLLECTIVE Noun—'people', 'army', 'nation', 'court', 'commission', 'galaxy'—is for all ordinary purposes a common, general, or class noun, and need not be regarded in any other light. So far, therefore, there is no grammatical reason for constituting it a distinct class. There is, however, a special usage in connexion with these nouns, that needs to be brought out under SYNTAX, with reference to the Concord of Noun and Verb. Sometimes a collection of persons or things is spoken of as acting separately or individually: 'the assembly *were* unanimous' is the same as 'the persons assembled were—'; although the noun is singular the meaning is plural; and the verb also must be plural.

It would be enough to reserve the mention of this peculiarity to Concord, under SYNTAX without specially bringing forward Collective Nouns as one of the grammatical classes of Nouns. The other four classes—Proper, Common, Abstract, Material—are constantly coming into view; the Collective noun with a distributive or plural predicate is of rare occurrence.

PROPER NOUNS.

Proper names have been usually exemplified by persons and places. They may be extended to material objects and works of industry; as ships, locomotive engines, buildings, monster guns, or other implements. I have included in the class also the names of Days, Months, Festivals; the

names of Branches of Knowledge; and the names of Diseases. To all these may be applied the designations Proper, Singular, and Meaningless; and they all possess the two grammatical peculiarities of the Proper Noun—no plural and no indefinite article.

The parsing of this division of Nouns is rendered occasionally uncertain by the following circumstances. In the first place, proper names are not always confined absolutely to one object; they are not, therefore, strictly speaking Singular. There may be a few instances of names that have always been confined to a single individual. It would be hazardous to affirm this of ordinary names of persons; it is possible that some names of historical personages, as Charlemagne, have not been given to any second individual. In regard to places, however, some names have remained attached to one locality; while others have been borrowed, or adopted, if not independently created, for other localities. Norway, Arabia, Indus, California, Connecticut, are strictly Singular names; England, London, York, and others have more than one application to places; while names originally of place come to be applied to natural products or works of industry, with or without modification. Such names, therefore, fail in the point of being strictly singular; but, nevertheless, they do not become *general*. We must call 'Stanley' a Proper name, though there are many persons designated by it; we must call 'Frankfort' a Proper name, although it is borne by two different places.

The repeating of the same Proper Name for persons is so frequent that we have classes formed from the circumstance, together with the usages of the common or class noun—a plural form, and the indefinite article before the noun in the singular—'the Stanleys'; 'a Macleod'. These names denote real classes, and are, therefore, for the time, Common or General Nouns, although based upon very slight bonds of community. The mere fact that any one is called 'Stanley' or 'Macleod', indeed assimilates the person to a large number of men and women, but gives scarcely any common feature; they are not necessarily even allied in

blood. Such names are to be treated as Proper Names, with an appearance or aspect of the class name.

Second, though the most rigid peculiarity of the Proper Name is given by the word 'meaningless', opposed to 'significant' the designation of the common or general name, yet here, too, an explanation is needed. Many Proper names—nearly all, if we knew their history—still have or once had meaning. The names of persons have often decided meanings—Black, Brown, Green, White, East, West, South, North, Ironside, Cruickshank, Smith, Baker, Baxter, Glover, Wright, Clark, Watson, Johnson, Macgill, Young, Elder, Clubb, Gunn, Rough, Square, Blackhall, Silver, Horn, Ivory, Marshall, Playfair. So the names of places: as Mississippi (father of waters), Snowdon (snow down), Jungfrau (maiden), Himalaya (house of snow), Copenhagen (merchants harbour), Coblenz (the Roman *Confluentes*, at *the junction* of the Rhine and the Moselle), Cologne (Lat. *Colonia* Agrippinensis, *colony* founded by Agrippina), Ouse, Isis, Esk (water), Drachenfels (dragon's rock).

Names may sometimes have been invented by shaking letters in a hat, or by putting together combinations on no other principle than to get something that is new and therefore distinctive; but a very large number even of proper names have significations that are still understood. For all this, they are rightly called 'meaningless' names; and why? Because the meaning is not taken into account in applying them. 'Black' is a significant name when used as an adjective to describe things that are black in colour; but when it is used as a proper name of persons, and handed down in a family, irrespective of the complexion of the individuals—being given alike to fair and to dark men and women—it is practically meaningless; what meaning it has is set aside, disregarded, and even contradicted. It is, therefore, a proper noun, in the most testing application; it gives no information respecting the person. If we were to interpret it according to its meaning, we might incur a falsehood; we, therefore, try to forget, and often succeed in forgetting, the original sense of such words.

The designation 'meaningless' is, I am aware, a stumbling-block to many, who think it unsuitable to words that really have a meaning, although for the special purpose that meaning has to be trodden under foot. I should be glad to discover a word not open to this objection, but as yet I do not know of any such.

One other remark has to be made with reference to the Proper Name. In many cases it consists not of one word, but of two or more, which conjointly make up the name:—Napoleon Bonaparte, John Milton, Monte Rosa, Peter Paul Rubens, Johann Christoph Friedrich Schiller. These double, triple, or quadruple names are useful for keeping distinct the great number of persons and places (especially persons) that have to be named. They must be treated as making each a single noun. In names of persons, the name and surname are equally meaningless, in the sense above understood; 'John' and 'Milton' are not general names.

There are combinations applicable to *singular* objects, and coming within the scope of proper names, where one of the words is openly and avowedly significant; as King John, Venerable Bede, Peter the Hermit, the Church of England, the Straits of Dover, Cape Kater. The words John, Bede, Peter, England, Dover, Kater, by themselves, are proper and meaningless nouns; but they are each accompanied by a word whose meaning is intended to be taken into account, being not set aside but complied with: the word 'king' is used with John, because John belonged to the class of Kings; the adjective 'venerable' used with Bede is intended to suggest its proper meaning in connexion with Bede. These may be called the *mixed* Proper Names. They are Proper, Singular, and in part, although not wholly, Meaningless.*

COMMON NOUNS.

The Common, General, Significant Noun, also called a Class

* I would recommend teachers to have by them, for reference, No. 106 of Chambers's Miscellany of Tracts, entitled 'Names of Persons'.

noun, has some exceptional usages that need to be accounted for.

In a regular or typical example, all the four epithets given are severally applicable. The nouns—man, poet, tree, river, town, shilling—are *common*, *general*, *significant*, and names of *classes*. They are common to many individual objects; they are general, or express some fact or facts generally; they are significant, and used only when their signification is complied with; each of them is a name for a class. All these designations point to one main circumstance, namely, that a number of objects have been found to *agree* in certain respects, while also, it may be, *differing* in other respects. The objects called by the name 'river', are numerous; but they have a number of features precisely alike—the flow of a body of water, &c.—while they have many differences as to locality, length, breadth, form, rapidity, and so on. The common or significant name is a name for the points of agreement; these points are its signification or meaning. The names are wrongly used, if the things do not possess the properties included in the meaning; the word 'river' must not be applied to a building, to a soldier, or to a money coin.

There are instances where a Singular object is named by words that are neither wholly meaningless nor yet mixed, but that are wholly significant; as Providence, the Queen, the late Pope. The first of these examples is figurative and rare; the second and third are so abundant and usual as to be a regular process of the language. A common or general noun, as Queen, Pope, Minister, applies indifferently to a number of persons; it does not name any one in particular; but we can place with it some other significant word or words that will limit its application even to single persons, rendering it a Singular Noun. *The* Queen, *our* Queen, the Queen *of this country;* the present Pope, the late Pope; the first minister of the crown,—are all limited to an individual, yet without the use of a strictly proper name. 'The house before us', 'the first man that you meet', 'the greatest modern poet', 'the leader of the expedition', 'the Mount of Olives', 'the Pole Star',—are all singular designations;

they are made up of significant words put together in such a way as to limit the meaning to one individual person or thing. Allowance must be made for this wide-spread usage; we call such names 'significant and singular names'. They do not in any way conflict with what is said of the common, general, or significant class name; they merely teach us that by two or more such names we can confine or narrow a meaning to such a degree that only one object is found to comply with it. The Adjective is distinguished by converting a class into some narrower class—tower, *square* tower; by putting several adjectives or equivalents to one noun, we may sometimes succeed in narrowing it to an individual. This, however, is done most effectually by the possessive adjectives, 'my', 'our', 'your', &c.,—because it will often happen that the possessor has only one of the kind named —*my* horse, *your* watch. The demonstratives, 'this', 'that', and the definite article, have a singularizing force.

ABSTRACT NOUNS.

The larger number of Abstract Nouns are formed from Adjectives:—truth, goodness, curiosity, honesty, wisdom, silence. They convey the meaning of the Adjective, in separation, or abstraction: *truth* means what is common to true assertions: *wisdom*, what is common to wise men or wise actions. They express not the agreeing things, but the fact of agreement; and this has necessarily a singular meaning. Hence they cannot be plural, nor have the indefinite article: we do not say 'wisdoms', '*a* goodness'. This is their grammatical peculiarity. They may be found with the definite article, '*the* wisdom'.

The Abstract Noun is known, first, from the meaning. We are aware that the word 'depth' signifies in separation the same as the adjective 'deep' in combination with the things; the word 'righteousness' is understood to mean what is common to righteous actions.

It may be known, next, from appearing in a singular form, without the indefinite article, or any of the substitutes for it.

(See INDEFINITE ARTICLE.) 'Honesty does not supersede wisdom'. 'honesty' and 'wisdom', being nouns in the singular without the article, are either Proper, Material, or Abstract. If we know from the sense that they are neither proper nor material, we must set them down as Abstract.

Third, an Abstract Noun is known by its derivation, a help that is not to be dispensed with. In the Adjective Abstracts, an adjective is compounded with one or other of a known class of terminations, as *th* (dearth), *ness* (soundness), *ty* (rapidity), *ce* (violence); or with some of the rare forms: (wis*dom*), hard*ship*, brave*ry*, hardi*hood*.

Much greater grammatical importance attaches to the abstract nouns formed from Verbs: conviction, division, hesitation, gravitation, obligation, conversation, procrastination, seclusion, belief, proof, birth, death, life, work, talk, knowledge, understanding, feeling, pleasure, passion, judgment, slaughter, laughter, dinner, announcement, reliance, allowance, excuse, marriage, reproach, learning, censure, failure, tenure. These words are naturally singular, and do not take the article (indefinite). But besides this they are often construed in the manner of the verb, as will be afterwards pointed out at length.

A few examples will show the grammatical similarity between them and the other abstracts. '*Division* of *labour*', '*gravitation* is as the inverse square of the distance', '*death* comes to all', 'he likes *work*', '*knowledge* to them her ample page unrolls', '*pleasure* is not wrong in itself', '*announcement* is made—', '*reproach* is due—', '*learning* ennobles a man', 'he detests *flattery*.' '*flight* or *retreat* was hopeless', 'the muscles are strengthened by *growth*', 'they gave much *attention* to the *tillage* of the ground.' In all such cases the nouns are construed in the singular without the indefinite article, and do not admit of the plural. The meaning is the same as if the corresponding verb were used in each case:—to divide labouring, to gravitate or gravitating, to die, to work, to know, knowing, to be pleased, announcing, to be reproached,

to have learned, flattering or being flattered, to flee or to retreat, growing, attending (they *attended* much), tilling. Such verbal abstracts are thus the equivalents of the cognate verbs; they give the action of the verb generally, and this constitutes a singular idea. The exceptions will be alluded to presently.

In the examples hitherto given, the nouns are plainly derived, one class from adjectives, the other class from verbs. There are, however, nouns where we do not readily trace either mode of derivation, and yet we must, from the grammatical analogy, regard them as abstract. Such are—grace, sin, law, nature, mind, art, time, space, fire, light, heat, power, principle, industry, war, peace. Some of these words are more or less remote derivatives of adjectives or nouns; while some are possibly identified with the earliest names of the language, which are names of action, or verbs. They are all employed as abstract terms, while they are nearly all used also as class nouns.

We can, in many instances, historically explain those abstract nouns that do not point to any adjective or verb. I append examples.

'Grace' is not traceable to any English word, adjective or verb. We know, however, that it is practically the meaning of the adjectives 'graceful', 'gracious': it does duty for 'gracefulness', 'graciousness' Accordingly, we may set it down as an *adjective* abstract. If, now, we trace it to Lat. *gratia*, from (adj.) *gratus*, our practical test is confirmed by the historical derivation.

'Industry' is an *adjective* abstract cognate with 'industrious': it gives the meaning of 'industriousness'. But historically, 'industry' can scarcely be said to be derived from 'industrious': the two have come into English side by side, representing Lat. *industria* and *(adj.) industrius*, the one being derived from the other.

'Capture' is a *verb* abstract, but it cannot be traced to any verb in English. It is Lat. *captura*, from *capio* (I take): we consider ourselves in want of the noun, but not of the parent verb. But without knowing the history of the word, we

should have been led by its meaning to say that it is the equivalent of 'taking', and thus a *verb* abstract.

'Commerce' has no cognate verb in English. Yet it bears exactly the same meaning as 'trading', whence we may at once, for all practical purposes, call it a *verb* abstract. The historical account of it takes us back to Lat. *commercium*, and thence to *commercor* (I trade, traffic): we took the noun and left the verb.

'Peace' means practically 'peacefulness', and may consequently be regarded as an *adjective* abstract. If, however, we look into the antecedents of 'peace', we shall find that the Lat. *pax* is historically a *verb* abstract with the sense of 'bargaining', 'agreeing'. Thus the practical view would be out of harmony with the historical origin of the word. But in such an instance, there is perhaps little advantage in pushing the pupil too closely. There are many words whose derivation cannot be stated with absolute certainty; and in remote or doubtful cases, the teacher (of Grammar—not of Philology) may reasonably be satisfied when the pupil knows the force of such words for practical use.

A few abstract nouns are formed from nouns, and express state; as kingship, generalship, lordship, statesmanship, statecraft, friendship, manhood, brotherhood, heroism, journalism, bondage, slavery, bigotry, bankruptcy:—the state of a king, &c. 'Virtue' in the Latin is of this kind—literally 'manhood', or 'manship'.

Use of Adjective Abstract Nouns as Common Nouns.

Many abstract nouns both are found in the plural, and take the indefinite article in the singular: 'truths, a truth'; 'forces, a force'. In such cases, they have departed from their character as abstract nouns, and have been turned into common or class nouns; 'truths' means not the property of being true, the fact common to all true statements, but the class 'true statements' itself. 'A truth' means a true doctrine, statement, or fact. 'A force' means an example or

exercise of force, as the force of gravity, the force of the wind; not the abstract property—force.

'Virtue', abstract, the quality common to virtuous actions and virtuous men: '*a* virtue, virtues', kinds or species of virtue; 'prudence is *a virtue*, and one of the four cardinal *virtues*'.

'Genius', abstract, the attribute common to certain men of great intellectual endowments: '*a* genius, geniuses', the men themselves: 'he has a genius for mechanics' means that he is capable of mechanical invention—that his genius lies in the department of mechanics.

'Misery acquaints a man with strange bedfellows'. 'Misery', abstract noun for what is common to miserable beings. 'A misery' is a single experience of misery; 'miseries' are either single experiences, or else species of misery—the miseries of being poor, of being unhealthy, of being oppressed.

'Variety', abstract (from 'various'), the general circumstance of varying our occupations and pleasures, instead of being confined to some single pursuit. 'A variety' and 'varieties' mean differing modes of things.

'Curiosity', the abstract state of mind, called also being curious, interested, anxious to know, 'a curiosity, curiosities', a class of things that inspire the feeling of being curious, or gratify it by their rare, remarkable, or distinguished character, as 'a cabinet of curiosities', 'the curiosities of literature'. Scotchmen will say 'I have a curiosity to know that man', which would mean an impulse of curiosity; but this is a gratuitous departure from the form 'I *am curious* to know'. There is something unsatisfactory in the use of the abstract word in the following sentence of Hume: 'The *curiosity*, entertained by the civilized nations, of enquiring into the exploits and adventures of their ancestors, commonly excites a regret—.' It would sound a little better thus—'The *feeling of curiosity*, common to all civilized nations, disposing them to enquire'. 'The curiosity of enquiring' can hardly be construed upon any received principle. We should say, with propriety, the 'curiosity of the

young mind', in the sense of relating the abstract to its concrete, as we say 'the fury of the tiger.'

Adjective abstracts have the same meaning as the Adjective: 'justice' is the point or points of agreement of 'just' men and 'just' actions. The adjective presents the meaning in the most intelligible shape, because it directs us to the things that we should have to examine and compare in order to discover the meaning. 'Truth' is understood by enquiring into the peculiarities common to 'true assertions'. We can understand the abstract only through the *concrete*, and this the adjective brings before us.

Use of Verb Abstracts as Common Nouns.

'A conversation' and 'conversations' mean special instances or occasions of conversing; and this is the general rule when the verbal abstracts are used as common nouns. 'Obligations' are special instances of being under obligation; 'debts' are special examples of being in debt. 'Feelings' are specific modes or exercises of the power of feeling. 'Reproaches' are particular acts of reproaching. 'Births' and 'deaths' are individual instances of being born and dying. 'Natures' may be regarded as a confined application of the abstract 'nature' to some particular cases; speaking of two individuals we say their 'natures' were different.

The liberty of converting such abstract words into class nouns is liable to abuse. We are apt to suppose that an abstract quality should not be declared of a plural subject without being itself made plural. 'I drink all your healths' is an example, and is inelegant from the awkwardness of making an abstract noun plural. We do not say 'I wish joys or happinesses to you all'. 'Their *natures* differ' would be better 'They differ in *nature*'.

'Knowledge' has never been made a class noun, although Sir W. Hamilton has defended 'knowledges' in a particular application. Hence the following is a gross impropriety—'Have you *a knowledge* of French?' for 'do you know?'.

We should not say 'I have no knowledge of', 'I have not the smallest knowledge'; rather, 'I do not know', 'I do not know at all, or in any degree'.

I doubt the propriety of the following sentence:—'The contrast between polygamous birds, the males of which *take no shares* in rearing the offspring, and monogamous birds, the males of which *take large shares* in rearing them, supplies significant evidence'. It is not merely that the phrase 'take shares' has contracted a technical signification wholly unsuited to the writer's meaning, but that the verbal noun 'share', which is here abstract, need not be plural though the subject is plural; 'take no share', and 'take much share' would be allowable and an improvement. I should prefer 'do not share', and 'share largely', for reasons to be given afterwards.

MATERIAL NOUNS.

The constituents of the globe, the raw material of commerce, and many of the productions of manufactures, receive names that are permanently singular, that can take neither the indefinite article nor the plural form. Such are wood, bone, horn, flint, quartz, glass, crystal, diamond, ivory, sulphur, zinc, tin, steel, hair, lime, potash, starch, sugar, alcohol, jute, oakum, canvas, paper, gunpowder, timber, grass, hair, muscle.

There must be many hundreds of such words in the language. The larger portion of them adhere to the grammatical peculiarities now stated. Some of the commoner names become class nouns, and assume both the article and the plural. In parsing, such instances should be duly accounted for.

Additional examples. 'Water' is perhaps the most familiar of our nouns of material. It appears often enough in this character: '*water* is usually liquid', '*water* is essential to vegetation'. But we have such expressions as, 'the sound of many *waters*'; 'our fleet was ordered to the Greek *waters*'; 'the *waters* of Vichy', &c.; 'some *waters* do not soften by boiling'; 'the goodness of *a water* depends on many causes'.

There are two meanings indicated in these examples: The one is *portions* or masses of water; the other is *kinds*, species or varieties of water.

'Airs' are different kinds of air.

'Salt' was originally the salt of the sea, and still bears that meaning; the word is also a common noun, 'salts', 'a salt', for many substances resembling the prototype, sea-salt.

'Wood' is a material name. It takes a plural to signify plantations of timber; and it has a less familiar use to signify species of wood.

'Coal', the material noun, is more frequently found in the plural 'coals', because we use it broken up in pieces. This deviation from the propriety of a material noun is scarcely called for; we might use the singular form 'coal' on most occasions; 'bring some coal' is more refined than 'bring coals'.

'Peat' is elaborately cut into equal shapes, and attention is thereby called to the plurality of the masses; we should in consequence expect the noun to be in use as a class noun—'a peat, peats'.

We have 'iron' and 'irons' ('too many *irons* in the fire'), 'lead' and 'leads', 'tin' and 'tins', copper' and 'coppers', in all which the material noun is made a class noun to denote certain utensils made of the metals. This is a considerable stretch of irregularity; seeing that accident decides what the things shall be, and that the same name may mean very different objects, as in the case with 'irons' and 'leads'. Such names have a narrow technical use, and can scarcely be considered as a part of the universal vocabulary.

'Sands' are grains of sand, a meaning never mistaken. Less commonly, do we understood varieties or kinds of sand. 'Dust' is a persistent and exclusive noun of material; the plural 'dusts' is unknown; the singular occurs in one proverbial utterance, 'kicking up a dust', the idea being a dust cloud. 'Ashes' is a false plural, and a regular noun of material. The singular form 'ash', with the same meaning, has obtained currency. Chemists speak

of 'pot*ash*, pearl*ash*, soda-*ash*, black *ash*', as well as 'ash' itself; we have also '*ash*-coloured' and *ash*pit'; while, in general literature, a person sometimes 'knocks the *ash* of his cigar into the stove'.

'Money' and 'cash' may be viewed as of the present class. Although the form passes from the valuable metals to written paper, which is unsubstantial and merely symbolical, we still regard it as a thing of matter, and as correctly designated by a material noun. 'Moneys', the plural is in use for sums of money; the corresponding singular 'a money' is not in use.

'Coin' is probably in its origin a class noun, a 'coin', 'coins'. The material noun, 'coin', is the secondary or derived form. This course is probably not unusual. We may suppose that 'cake' was originally a class noun, 'a cake, cakes'; and that the name was thence transferred to express the material noun without reference to its divisions or pieces.

'Snow' is seldom a class noun; the 'snows of years' is figurative and exceptional.

'Poison' is in full use both as a material and a class noun. 'Poison' means the power of poisoning generally; 'poisons' are the several poisonous substances.

In this last example, as in various others, a thin line divides the material noun from the *abstract* noun; but even when there is considerable doubt, the decision is not essential to Grammar; the grammatical usages being the same for both kinds. 'Tragedy' and 'comedy' are material or abstract nouns, very much as we please; both have class nouns corresponding—'tragedies', 'comedies'—meaning special embodiments of what the general words signify. In such instances, we had better incline to the designation Abstract. 'Disease', 'fever', &c., may be regarded as abstract nouns.

THE PRONOUN.

In the Introduction, I discussed the mode of defining the Pronoun. I shall now consider the Classification of the Pronouns, and give examples of the more important constructions wherein they play a part.

The first class commonly recognised is the PERSONAL PRONOUNS, those applicable to Persons. It will be seen that in the Pronouns, although not in the Nouns, grammar requires the distinction between Persons and Things.

There are said to be three Persons, and three sets of personal pronouns. This needs some qualification, as will appear on examining the details.

The pronouns said to be of the First Person, 'I', 'we', apply only to persons. Only a person can act as a speaker or unite with others in making a declaration.

Those of the Second Person, 'thou', 'you', 'ye', are also confined to persons, who alone can be intelligibly addressed.

Under the Third Person, 'he', 'she', 'it', 'they', we have a mixture of persons and inanimate things. For, although speakers and hearers must have personality, the matters spoken about are both persons and things. Here, then, the designation '*personal* pronoun' ceases to be applicable; and if we would circumscribe or define the group with precision, we must seize hold of some other circumstance. Hence the proposal, by Dr. Latham and others, to call them the *Demonstrative* pronouns. They serve to *point at* the subjects of discourse between two parties—speaker and hearer; and they perform this function along with the adjectives called Demonstrative—'this', 'that', 'these' 'those'. When a subject just mentioned is referred to by 'he' or 'it', the meaning is as truly demonstrative as when we use the phrase 'this man' or 'that matter'; the difference consists only in the greater force and explicitness of the phrase. And in assigning the class of 'he' and 'she', though their reference is to *persons*, the

demonstrative function must be held to be the overruling consideration; the use of different words to point to individuals possessing the attribute of sex, is an entirely subordinate convenience.

PRONOUNS OF THE FIRST PERSON.

The ordinary uses of 'I' and 'we', as the singular and plural pronouns of the first person, would appear to be above all ambiguity, uncertainty, or dispute. Yet when we consider the force of the plural 'we', we are met with a contradiction; for, as a rule, only one person can speak at the same time to the same audience. It is only by some exceptional arrangement, or some latitude or license of expression, that several persons can be conjoint speakers. For example, a plurality may sing together in chorus, and may join in the responses at church, or in the simultaneous repetition of the Lord's Prayer or the Creed. Again, one person may be the authorised spokesman in delivering a judgment or opinion held by a number of persons in common. Finally, in written compositions, the 'we' is not unsuitable, because a plurality of persons may append their names to a document.

A speaker using 'we' may speak for himself and one or more others; commonly he stands forward as the representative of a class, more or less comprehensive. 'As soon as my companion and I had entered the field, *we* saw a man coming toward *us*'; '*we* like *our* new curate'; 'you do *us* poets the greatest injustice'; '*we* must see to the efficiency of *our* forces'. The widest use of the pronoun will be mentioned presently.

'We' is used for 'I' in the decrees of persons in authority; as when King Lear says—

> 'Know that *we* have divided
> In three *our* kingdom'.

By the fiction of plurality a veil of modesty is thrown over the assumption of vast superiority over human beings generally. Or, 'we' may be regarded as an official form

whereby the speaker personally is magnified or enabled to rise to the dignity of the occasion.

The editorial 'we' is to be understood on the same principle. An author using 'we' appears as if he were not alone, but sharing with other persons the responsibility of his views.

This representative position is at its utmost stretch in the practice of using 'we' for human beings generally; as in discoursing on the laws of human nature. The preacher, the novelist, or the philosopher, in dwelling upon the peculiarity of our common constitution, being himself an example of what he is speaking of, associates the rest of mankind with him, and speaks collectively by means of 'we'. '*We* are weak and fallible'; '*we* are of yesterday'; '*we* are doomed to dissolution'. 'Here have *we* no continuing city, but *we* seek one to come'.

It is not unfrequent to have in one sentence, or in close proximity, both the editorial and the representative meaning, the effect being ambiguity and confusion. 'Let *us* [the author] now consider why *we* [humanity generally] overrate distant good'. In such a case the author should fall back upon the singular for himself—'*I* will now consider—'. '*We* [speaker] think *we* [himself and hearers together] should come to the conclusion'. Say either '*I* think', or '*you* would'.

The following extract from Butler exemplifies a similar confusion:—'Suppose *we* [representative] are capable of happiness and of misery in degrees equally intense and extreme, yet *we* [rep.] are capable of the latter for a much longer time, beyond all comparison. *We* [change of subject to a limited class] see men in the tortures of pain—. Such is *our* [back to representative] make that any thing may become the instrument of pain and sorrow to *us*'. The 'we' at the commencement of the second sentence—'*We* see men in the tortures'—could be advantageously changed to 'you', or the passive construction could be substituted; the remaining *wes* would then be consistently representative.

From the greater emphasis of singularity, energetic

speakers and writers sometimes use 'I' as representative of mankind at large. Thus: 'The current impressions received through the senses are not voluntary in origin. What *I* see in walking is seen because *I* have an organ of vision'. The question of general moral obligation is forcibly stated by Paley in the individual form, 'Why am *I* obliged to keep my word?' It is sometimes well to confine the attention of the hearer or reader to their own relation to the matter under consideration, more especially in difficult or non-popular argument or exposition. The speaker, by using 'I', does the action himself, or makes himself the example, the hearer being expected to put himself in the same position.

PRONOUNS OF THE SECOND PERSON.

Anomalous usages have sprung up in connection with these pronouns also. The plural form has almost wholly superseded the singular; a usage more than five centuries old.*

The motive is courtesy. The singling out of one person for address is supposed to be a liberty or an excess of familiarity; and the effect is softened or diluted by the fiction of taking in others. If our address is uncomplimentary, the sting is lessened by the plural form; and if the reverse, the shock to modesty is not so great. This is a refinement that was unknown to the ancient languages. The orators of Greece delighted in the strong, pointed, personal appeal implied in the singular 'thou'. In modern German, 'thou' *(du)* is the address of familiarity and intimacy; while the ordinary pronoun is the curiously indirect 'they' *(Sie)*. On solemn occasions, we may revert to 'thou'. Cato, in his meditative soliloquy on reading Plato's views on the immortality of the soul before killing himself, says—'Plato, *thou* reasonest well'. So in the Commandments, 'thou' addresses to each individual an unavoidable appeal: '*Thou* shalt not——'. But our ordinary means of making the personal appeal is, 'you, *sir*', 'you, *madam*', 'my *Lord*, you——', &c.; we reserve 'thou' for the special case of ad-

* 'The use of the plural for the singular was established as early as the beginning of the 14th century.'—Morris, p. 118, § 153.

dressing the Deity. The application of the motive of courtesy is here reversed; it would be irreverent to merge this vast personality in a promiscuous assemblage.

In vituperation or contempt, the force of 'thou' was at one time strongly marked. Sir Edward Coke, the king's attorney, addressed Sir Walter Raleigh at his trial thus: 'All that he (Lord Cobham) did was by *thy* instigation, *thou* viper; for I THOU *thee*, *thou* traitor'. So Faithful's judge in the Pilgrim's Progress addresses him '*thou* runagate, heretic, &c'. Sir Toby Belch (Twelfth Night, iii. 2) instructs his friend Sir Andrew Aguecheek in the composition of a challenge: 'If thou *thou'st* him some thrice, it shall not be amiss'. Petruchio's vehement outburst upon the tailor is a notable example (Taming of the Shrew, iv. 3).

'You' is not unfrequently employed, like 'we', as a representative pronoun. The action is represented with great vividness when the person or persons addressed may be put forward as the performers: 'There is such an echo among the old ruins and vaults, that if *you* stamp a little louder than ordinary, *you* hear the sound repeated'; 'Some practice is required to see these animals in the thick forest, even when *you* hear them close by *you*'.

There should not be a mixture of 'thou' and 'you' in the same passage. Thus, Thackeray (Adventures of Philip) 'So, as *thy* sun rises, friend, over the humble housetops round about *your* home, shall *you* wake many and many a day to duty and labour'. So, Cooper (Waterwitch): '*Thou* hast both master and mistress? *You* have told us of the latter, but we would know something of the former. Who is *thy* master?' Shakespeare, Scott, and others might also be quoted.

'Ye' and 'you' were at one time strictly distinguished as different cases; 'ye' was nominative, 'you' objective (dative or accusative). But the Elizabethan dramatists confounded the forms irredeemably; and 'you' has gradually ousted 'ye' from ordinary use. 'Ye' is restricted to the expression of strong feeling, and in this employment occurs chiefly in the poets.

DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

These pronouns, formerly called pronouns of the Third Person—'he, she, it, they'—merit a large share of attention. The clearness of composition is more dependent upon them than upon any single matter coming within the scope of grammar.

Our language is at a great disadvantage in having but one demonstrative pronoun; the four forms being merely the varieties for gender and number. We are thus without the power of keeping distinct two antecedents, if they are of the same gender and number—two men, two women, two things, two plurals of any gender. The Latin language is profuse in varieties of the demonstrative—*hic, ille, iste, is, ipse, se;* and so can manage with ease two or even three concurring subjects. Our weakness may be seen from the following passage in our translation of the New Testament (Luke xviii. 15, 16): 'And *they* (the people: no pronoun in Greek,—verb in 3rd plural) brought unto him also infants (*τὰ βρέφη*) that he would touch *them* (*αὐτά*, the infants); but when his disciples saw it, *they* (the disciples) rebuked *them* (*αὐτοῖς* the people or the infants). But Jesus called *them* (*αὐτά*, the infants) unto him, and said, Suffer little children (*τὰ παιδία*) to come unto me and forbid *them* (*αὐτά*, the little children) not.' In the Vulgate, by means of the pronouns *illos* and *eos*, two of the subjects are kept distinct, and the narrative freed from ambiguity. Our resource in such a case would be to repeat the antecedents in the parts where the collision is worst; 'but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked *the people* (or *the infants*). But Jesus called the *infants* to him'.

It will be afterwards seen that this defect is to some extent supplied by certain adjectives—including the demonstratives, 'this' and 'that'. In the present connexion, we shall advert to the rules for guiding us in referring a pronoun to its antecedent. These rules are common to all the four forms—'he, she, it, they'; and they keep us right in a great number of cases where there are apparently more than one

subject of reference. Some special devices for the same purpose may be noted incidentally as we proceed.

One rule is to interpret a pronoun as referring to the *principal* or *prominent subject* of the antecedent clause. The other rule is to interpret it as referring to the *nearest* subject. Prominence and Proximity are thus the two governing considerations; and they very often conflict.

'In this war both Marius and Sulla served; Sulla increased *his* (Sulla's) reputation, Marius tarnished *his*. Some plead for *him* (Marius, the last named) age and illness'. Here Proximity is the interpreting principle. In a very important reference, however, such as this, the proximity should be aided by prominence. This might be gained by slightly modifying the sentence structure: 'In this war both Marius and Sulla served. While Sulla increased his reputation, Marius tarnished his. Some plead for him——'. In this second sentence, by putting Sulla in a subordinate clause, Marius obtains the chief place.

The following is one of many examples in Spenser, where two personages are on the stage, and where the reader has no guide but the sense to tell which is referred to by the pronouns:

'Therewith upon *his* crest
With rigor so outrageous *he* smitt,
That a large share it hew'd out of the rest,
And glancing down *his* shield, from blame *him* fairly blest.'

In Hebrews iii. 2 we read: 'Who (Christ Jesus) was faithful to *him* (1) (meaning a person to be pointed out by the following clause) that appointed *him* (2) (Christ Jesus), as also Moses was faithful in all *his* (3) (Moses') house'.

The following rich specimen is from Roderick Random, chap. 2: 'The pedant assured *his* (1) patron that although *he* (1) could not divest the boy of the knowledge *he* (2) had already imbibed, unless *he* (3) would empower *him* (1) to disable *his* (2) fingers, *he* (1) should endeavour, with God's help, to prevent *his* (2) future improvement'. It might be relieved by means of slight changes: 'The pedant . . . of knowledge already imbibed, unless *he were empowered* to

disable *the little trickster's* fingers, . . . to prevent *his pupil's* future improvement'. The pronoun now refers exclusively to the pedant.

Some readers may have been puzzled with the following newspaper announcement: 'The Emperor Alexander presented to the Emperor William a portrait of *himself*' Of which? The only rule to go by is proximity, and that would make it a portrait of William. The meaning intended is doubtless—'Alexander presented a portrait of himself to William'.

The next example, from Butler, is not so obscure as might be expected; ambiguity is kept off by means of the regularity of the balanced structure. 'Almost any man is capable of doing mischief to any other, though *he* (1) may not be capable of doing *him* (2) good; and if *he* (1) be capable of doing *him* (2) some good, *he* (1) is capable of doing *him* (2) more evil'.

Occasionally writers, on becoming conscious of ambiguity, insert an explanatory noun immediately after the pronoun. This noun is sometimes, but not always, within brackets. Smollett writes: 'The doctor begged the captain to pardon Morgan with *his* (1) wonted goodness, upon condition that *he* (2), *the delinquent*, should make such submission as the nature of *his* (2) misdemeanour demanded'. The insertion of *the delinquent* intimates a change of reference of *he*. 'Then a certain Abbot named Cyneberht, . . . went to Ceadwalla, and asked that, if *he* (1) would not spare their lives, *he* (1) would at least let *him* (2), *Cyneberht*, try and make them Christians before they died'.

Where the reference is to the Deity, the capital saves ambiguity. 'And when Winifrith was left alone, God had pity on *him*, and *He* opened *his* eyes and *he* saw'.

Most troublesome of all the Demonstratives is the neuter pronoun IT.

'The *wind* blew down the *wall*; *it* was very high'. This is ambiguous; the pronoun being referable to 'wind' as

principal subject, and to 'wall' as in immediate proximity; while the sense does not readily decide between the two.

'*Adversity* gives *wisdom*; *it* ought to be greatly prized'. If 'adversity' be the antecedent, the sentence had better stand thus: 'Adversity gives wisdom, and ought (therefore) to be greatly prized' If 'wisdom' be the antecedent, say —'*which* ought &c.'

Besides the backward reference to a noun, 'it' may also point backwards to an infinitive or to a clause, expressed or understood. 'He expected *to be condemned to death*,—he even desired *it*'; 'it' referring to the infinitive, 'to be condemned to death'. 'He shot a stag, and was fined for *it*' —that is, 'for *shooting the stag*', the infinitive phrase being implied in the first statement. 'We had the same objects in view as they had, and took pains to show *it*',—'to show *(that) we had the same objects in view as they had*'. 'The chief priests and the Pharisees had given a commandment that, if any man knew where he (Jesus) were, he should show *it*',—that is, 'show *where Jesus was*'. 'Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew *it* not': the antecedent is not 'place', but the whole expression, '*(that) the Lord was this place*'.

Again, 'it' is used very extensively as a provisional subject, the real thing predicated about following in the form of infinitive or noun clause, rarely as a noun. This is called the Prospective or Anticipative use of 'it'. '*It* is not allowed to walk on the grass': 'it' is the formal subject, anticipating the real subject, the infinitive phrase—'to walk on the grass'. '*It* is upon record that a battle between two armies was once broken off by an earthquake': 'it' is prospective, looking forward to the noun clause—'that a battle . . earthquake'. '*It* would be selfish if we wished to keep him from going'. This is a nice case; 'It' anticipates, not the clause 'if we wished &c.', which is adverbial, but an infinitive phrase or a noun clause implied in that adverbial clause: '*it—our wishing (infinitive)*, or *that we should wish (noun clause)*, to keep him from going—would be selfish if we wished &c.'

'It' anticipating a noun is common enough in conversation, but seldom finds its way into composition, except in very familiar style. Thackeray says: ''Tis surprising *the magnetic attraction* which draws people together from ever so far'. Even in a historical sketch (Principal Tulloch: *Luther*—in 'Leaders of the Reformation'): '*It* seems a grand and heroic spectacle *this solitary man* in the old fortress of Coburg, looking &c.' And the other demonstratives are occasionally used in the same way, and in similar circumstances. But such examples are not to be imitated.

The indefinite use of 'it', where there is no visible antecedent, may also be further exemplified here. In many cases the reference may readily be supplied; in others, it is rather intangible. '*It* is very cold'—that is, of course, the *weather;* a thing ever in the mouth of everybody one meets, and consequently in no need of being specified. '*It* is the hush of night': the context indicates *time*. 'How far is't called to Forres?'—the inquiry refers to *distance*. The meaning in the following example, from Matthew Arnold *(Sohrab & Rustum)*, hardly admits of concise expression:

'———— in our tents, while *it* is war,
And when 'tis truce, then in Afrasiab's towns'.

And in the next example, the reference is at the point of vanishing, if indeed it has not already vanished: 'We have no other course for *it* but to steer through the twilight on the bearing of Burgh-Westra, and rough *it* out as well as we can by the way'.

The worst cases of the ambiguity of the neuter pronoun arise from the forward or Prospective reference, which, on numberless occasions, is mixed up with the retrospective references, whether to a single term or to a clause. These are the complications that need to be pointedly set forth.

The following is a double case of the *Prospective reference by itself*. 'When *it* is asked *wherein consists personal identity*, the answer should be the same as if *it* were asked, *wherein consists sameness or equality*'. Each 'it' refers to a clause coming after, and there is no confusion. We may notice in-

cidentally that here again the balanced structure also contributes to the clearness of reference.

We shall now give copious examples of Ambiguous construction, stating at the same time various means of overcoming the difficulty. The method of cure depends very much upon the constitution of the individual sentences.

'When men are thoroughly possessed with zeal, *it* (1) is difficult to estimate *its* (2) force; but *it* (3) is certain that *its* (2) power is by no means in exact proportion to *its* (2) reasonableness'. The main subject is 'zeal,' and to that the pronoun should be confined: the prospective references (1) (3) should be avoided. For 'it is difficult' say 'there is (a) difficulty'; and for 'it is certain', say 'but certainly its power'.

'An event is said to be conditioned, if *it* is assumed that *it* occurs under a certain condition'. The first 'it', which is prospective, should be done away with; it would naturally refer backward to 'event': say 'if *the assumption is*'. Or 'if *it* is assumed *to occur*'—the reference now being to 'event'.

'If by happiness be meant a continuity of highly pleasurable excitement, (*it* is evident enough that) 'evidently enough' this is impossible'. The 'it' is so placed as to refer to the principal subject 'happiness'; this not being the case, we ought to remove it.

The idiom '*it* is', beginning a sentence or a clause, is one of great value, enabling us to gain emphasis by inverting the grammatical order of subject and predicate. The occasions of ambiguity, however, are very frequent; and every one needs to know the alternative modes of obtaining the effect. Examples have been already given; the one leading device is to substitute for the impersonal verb, the corresponding verbal noun. '*It* is asserted', 'the assertion is made'; '*It* is proper to defer judgment', 'judgment had better be deferred'; '*it* would not be incompatible', 'there would be no incompatibility'; '*it* will be explained', 'the explanation will be given'; '*it* may be doubted whether', 'a doubt may be expressed'. 'The curiosity is not illiberal that which

would seek', is instead of '*it* is not an illiberal curiosity to seek'.

Another mode given in the examples is by 'there is', instead of 'it is'. '*It* was *necessary* that man should find out', '*there* was *a necessity* that man should find out'.

We may also adopt the alternative of giving a word more general than the subject; speaking of the horse, instead of 'it' we can say 'the animal', 'the quadruped', and so on. 'Here a British frigate was lost in consequence of having struck on a rock, the blow causing *the ship* [more general term, instead of 'it'] to fill and founder very suddenly'.

The prominence of the complement in adverbial form has also been exemplified. '(*It* is probable that) *Probably* the ship will sail to-morrow'. '(*It* was seldom that anger deprived) *Seldom did anger deprive* him of power over himself'. Sometimes the fuller form may be considered desirable *for emphasis*, as here: 'In such cases *it* is almost *impossible* to ascertain the truth'.

There are many instances where a more substantial subject than 'it' may be substituted—especially a personal subject. '(*It* has long been the custom for the Orangemen of the North) *The Orangemen of the North have long been accustomed* to celebrate the anniversaries of the closing of the gates of Derry and of the battle of the Boyne'. '(*It* appeared that he understood) *He appeared to understand* me well enough'. '(*It* will be in the recollection of our readers) *Our readers will recollect* that—'. '(*It* was hoped) *Hopes were entertained* that—'. '*It* was foretold that a flood would come'—*A flood was foretold.*

So familiar are we with 'it is' introducing a prospective reference, that there is a propriety in using the form as little as possible with the backward reference.

'(*It* may be remarked) 'We may remark' that wit is very commonly mixed with the ludicrous although [*it* is] not itself necessarily laughable. (*It* was asserted) 'The assertion was made' by Lord Chesterfield, himself a proficient in the art of producing (*it*) 'the quality', that true wit never occasioned laughter in any human being since the creation of the world.

(*It* must be owned) 'we must own', however, that as its essence is to give pleasure, so its tendency is to raise a smile, between which and a laugh (*it* would frequently require a nice casuist) 'a nice casuist would be required' to draw the line of demarcation.'

The following is from De Quincey's description of his encounter with George III. at Windsor. 'Now, for the first time, I was meeting him nearly face to face; for although the walk we occupied was not that in which the royal party was moving, *it* ran so near *it*, and was connected by so many cross walks at short intervals, that (*it* was a matter of necessity for us) 'the necessity lay upon us' 'we had no choice but' to go and present ourselves'. The two references in '*it* ran so near *it*', might be avoided: 'for though the walk we occupied was not the one the royal party was moving in, *it* ran so near *that*—'.

'Although *it* is impossible to agree with this opinion in *its* whole extent, as language, whatever may be *its* defects, is the only means by which knowledge can be preserved and communicated; yet *it* is difficult to overtake *its* influence or meaning.' The two prospective *its* should here be avoided; the others, except the last, are referable to their immediate antecedents—'opinion', 'language'; the last '*its* influence' is ambiguous from the distance of the antecedent; and may refer equally to 'language' and to 'opinion'.

'*It* is not expected that they should do much'; 'much is not expected from them'.

'This opinion is just, but *it* is possible to rely on *it* too long'; 'but *it may be relied on* too long'.

'Tennyson's meaning sometimes goes so deep that *it* is impossible to discover *it*'. Here the first 'it' anticipates the infinitive phrase, the second is retrospective to 'meaning'. Say—'that *it* cannot be discovered', or, 'that average readers cannot discover *it*'; or, briefly, 'His meaning is sometimes unfathomable'.

'*It* is easier to talk of humility than to feel *it*'. The remedy may be by the passive voice with 'humility' as

subject; or by taking an indefinite pronoun—'one'—as subject.

'*It* (1) being this man's business to flatter and make sermons, *it* (2) must be owned that he was most industrious in *it* (3)'. (Thackeray.) 'This man's business being to flatter . . . industrious in *his calling* [substitution of synonym]'.

'The parallel between the two cases is complete, and *it* (1) was a defect in the Education Act that *it* (2) tried to ignore *it* (3)'. (1) Is prospective to noun clause 'that it tried to ignore it'; (2) is retrospective to 'the Education Act'; (3) is still further retrospective, probably to 'the parallel'.

'*It* (1) [the Norman Conquest] did not abolish the English language; but *it* (1) brought in a new language by *its* (2) side, which for a while supplanted *it* (2) as the language of polite intercourse, and which did not yield to the reviving elder speech till *it* (3) had infected *it* (2 or 'elder speech') by the largest infusion that the vocabulary of one European tongue ever received from another'.

'In these two ways, then, the dominance of Latin proved baneful to the study of English; *it* (1) for many a day made that study seem despicable and unworthy—in effect suppressed *it* (2); and, when at last *it* (2) could no longer be suppressed, then still *it* (1) overshadowed and withered *it* (2)'.

Sometimes the first 'it' anticipates an infinitive or a clause, and the second 'it' refers back to the same expression. In such instances there is seldom any real ambiguity, the reference being to one subject; yet the double action of the 'it' always suggests the possibility of being led astray. '*It* would be absurd to make another attempt; *it* would be a mere throwing away of money': '*it*' refers first forward and then backward to the infinitive expression 'to make another attempt'. In this example—as always when both *its* are subject—the second 'it' may be regarded as simply a resumption of the same position as the first 'it' holds, with a view to another predication about it. '*It* is true my

purposes are innocent, but how is *it* to appear?'—namely, 'that my purposes are innocent'.

Two unquestionably prospective *its* in succession may be troublesome. When the expressions are co-ordinate and not very closely connected, there is not necessarily any difficulty: as—'*It* was impossible to abolish kingly government; yet *it* was plain that no confidence could be placed in the king'. Here the reference is clear enough, first to an infinitive, next to a clause. So: '*It* was at length determined to abandon all schemes of offensive war; and *it* soon appeared that even a defensive war was a task too hard for that administration'. But if one of the expressions is subordinate or involved in the other, the double *it* should be avoided: '*It* should not be forgotten that for the provinces *it* was a distinct gain to get one master instead of many'. Even though the meaning cannot reasonably be considered ambiguous, the double use of 'it' is suggestive of ambiguity, as well as awkward and inelegant. Another example: '*It* would evidently be a great assistance if *it* should happen to be the fact that one element exceeds all the rest'.

The pronoun THEY merges sex, and therefore has not the advantage of keeping persons separate from things. Without having the same variety of reference as the singular neuter demonstrative, this pronoun abundantly occasions perplexity to the reader.

'Many of *their* [the Teutons'] chief settlements, and among *them* our own settlement in Britain, happened so late that we know a good deal about *them*'. 'Their' means persons, the Teutons; 'them' means things, settlements. Recast thus: 'Many of the chief *Teutonic* [corresponding adjective] settlements, and among *these* [a form very convenient for an immediate reference] our own settlement'. The single remaining 'them' will now refer unmistakably to the principal subject 'settlements'.

'The Presbyterians were secured by the appointment of the Assembly of Divines to reform the church after *their* model'. The reference of 'their' is to the principal subject;

but, from proximity, 'divines' is a rival antecedent, and we are at a loss which to choose. Better say 'to reform the church after the *presbyterian* model'; the importance of the qualification of 'model' is too great to be left in doubt.

The following is an example of the confusion of 'they' in poetry:—

'Happy those times
When lords were styled fathers of families,
And not imperious masters! when *they* (1) number'd
Their (1) servants almost equal with *their* (1) sons,
Or one degree beneath *them* (2)! when *their* (3) labours
Were cherish'd and rewarded, and a period
Set to *their* (3) sufferings; when *they* (1) did not press
Their (3) duties or *their* (3) wills beyond the power
And strength of *their* (3) performance'.

No. 1 is lords, No. 2 sons, No. 3 servants.

'This word *Barbarians*, in its first use among the Greeks, simply meant that the people so called were people whose language the Greeks did not understand. *They* (1) called *them* (2) *Barbarians* even though *their* (2) blood and speech were nearly akin to *their* (1) own, if only the difference was so great that *their* (2) speech was not understood'.

Here is a sentence from Thackeray: 'If *they* (1) [the Prince's soldiers] miss the cupboard, *they* (1) will not find these [articles]; if *they* (1) do find *them* (2), *they*'ll (2) tell no tales'.

In the following the chances of ambiguity are lessened by a certain regularity of form: 'The Israelites were forbidden even to mention the names of the gods of the Canaanite nations; *they* (1) were commanded to burn or destroy *their* (2) images, *their* (2) altars, *their* (2) sacred groves; *they* (1) were to deem accursed the precious metals of which *their* (2) idols were composed, and on no pretence whatever were *they* (1) to conclude any treaty or make any marriage with *them* (2)'. In each assertion 'The Israelites' hold the prominent place. The influence of the balanced structure is distinctly felt.

Something of the forward reference may be seen in the statement, '*They* are under way, *those sacraments*' (Carlyle). This use of 'they' corresponds to such singular forms as '*He* fell in her arms, *the poor wounded Hussar*'. Examples of 'it' were given above (p. 45).

The singular form '*he* of the grey coat', '*he* of the one leg', has a plural; as in '*they* of Arcadia', '*they* in France of the best rank and station'. 'They' is used for 'the persons'; but the meaning is incomplete, and we have to look forward for a qualifying adjunct. Not unfrequently a clause follows: 'How sweet is the rest of *them that labour!*' The corresponding singular pronouns are similarly used, especially with the clause. The adjunct is always restrictive.

THIS and THAT as Pronouns.

In the use of these words, we borrow from the Latin the distinction between *hic* and *ille*: *hic*, 'this', is the nearer of two mentioned, and *ille*, 'that', the more distant. 'This' may refer to something immediately preceding, or to something immediately to follow: it suits the reference of proximity better than the regular pronouns. 'That' does not willingly undertake the forward reference.

In most cases, 'this' and 'that' have probably a greater emphasis than the ordinary demonstratives, the reference being apparently given with more point and directness.

'This', like 'it', refers *backward* (1) to a single term, (2) to an infinitive phrase, and (3) to a noun clause.

(1) 'The king took no care of his dignity. He knew that *this* was in no danger'. 'This' refers to the noun 'dignity', immediately preceding. Perhaps the same emphasis could not be given by 'it', except through the aid of italics.

(2) 'Berwick was meantime endeavouring to persuade the Jacobite aristocracy to rise in arms. But *this* was no easy task'. 'This' stands for the preceding infinitive expression 'to persuade the Jacobite . . . arms'. The reference is given with rather more stress than would be exerted by 'it'.

(3) 'Henry ordered certain Scottish ships to be seized. The Estates declared *this* to be a breach of the treaties'. 'This' is the fact that 'Henry ordered . . to be seized'.

'This', like 'it', has a prospective or *forward* reference, (1) to an infinitive phrase, and (2) to a noun clause. The usage draws pointed attention to the expression anticipated.

(1) 'I learned *this* at least, to bear up against evil fortune with a cheerful heart'. 'This' anticipates the infinitive expression 'to bear up &c'. It is a very emphatic provisional object to 'learned'. In such an instance, 'it' could not be substituted without other considerable changes. The next example comes near the typical use of 'it'.

'*This* was all thy care,
To stand approvéd in the sight of God'.

(2) 'This' anticipating a noun clause: '*This* now is wickedness, *that any man should seek to drive me out of the seat of my fathers*'. 'Their real complaint against him was precisely *this, that he was not dangerous*'. These examples may be compared with the similar use of 'it'.

'That' may be said to be confined to the *backward* reference. It may point to (1) a noun, (2) an infinitive phrase, and (3) a noun clause.

(1) 'The public had little relish for *the glow of enthusiastic passion*, or *the richness of a luxuriant imagination*. To *those*, accordingly, Queen Anne's wits made no pretensions'. 'Those' points back to two nouns.

(2) 'He appears to have good intentions; but *that* is not enough'. *That*, namely, 'to have good intentions', is not enough.

(3) 'All men desire happiness; *that*'s past doubt'. '*That*, namely, that 'all men desire happiness', is past doubt.

'He stood his ground, and *that* firmly.' 'That' saves by a pointed reference the repetition of the statement 'he stood his ground'.

'I am not so sure of *that*'; '*that* is the question'; '*this* is intolerable'; 'I do not understand *this*': in such in-

stances, the pronouns refer to infinitives or clauses, expressed or implied; or to actions or facts that, if expressed at all, would be expressed in these forms.

It is in the backward or retrospective reference to nouns that 'this' and 'that' are most commonly serviceable for keeping off ambiguity. They may often replace 'it' or 'they' with great advantage to emphasis as well as to clearness. Besides, their sharp, decisive reference affords pleasing variety.

'All researches should conform to the four methods if *they* are complete'. 'They' may apply equally to 'researches' and to 'methods'; the ambiguity may be cured by 'these' which could apply only to 'methods'.

The same cure is applicable here: 'Boys in general cannot be brought to get any good from the thoughts of Plato and Homer by *their* study of the tongue in which *they* wrote'. 'Their' refers to 'boys', and should be omitted. 'They' refers, by proximity, to 'Plato and Homer'; but for this purpose we should prefer 'these', whereby we also avoid the competing reference by importance.

'The place where his jewels were, they never ransacked; so *those* he kept still'. If the ordinary pronoun 'them' had been used, it would have clashed with the preceding 'they'. 'Those' refers back unmistakeably and pointedly to 'jewels'. There would be little objection to 'these' here: although 'those' is more suitable for the distant reference. Were the first sentence not inverted, 'these' would be the appropriate pronoun.

'Though nothing else be gained by it but the stilling of a scandalous tongue, even *that* will be worth thy labour'. 'It' could not replace 'that' here, being used earlier in the sentence with a different reference; to say nothing of its comparative feebleness. The general reference of 'that' is certain, although the exact form intended by the writer may be doubtful. 'Even *that thou gain the stilling* &c.',—a noun clause implied; or 'even *to gain the stilling* &c.'—an infinitive implied; or 'even *the stilling of a scandalous tongue* will

be worth thy labour',—a noun. All the forms give practically the same meaning. 'This' would be equally appropriate, especially if the last be the intended reference.

In the following example, 'that' gathers up all the parts of the process with weighty compactness: 'Writing a discourse coolly in the closet, then getting it by memory, and delivering it on Sundays, even *that* will not do.' By the side of this, it would be exceedingly weak to say: '*it* will not do even to write a discourse &c'. Moreover, 'it' is otherwise engaged, standing twice for 'discourse'.

'He shall have from me five hundred pounds as her fortune; and upon *this* I am sure they can live very comfortably together'. The reference of 'this' might be expected to be, by the rule of proximity, to 'her fortune'; but perhaps the reference intended is, by prominence or importance, to the specific 'five hundred pounds'. In the latter case, 'that' might be considered more proper. Goldsmith should have written—'He shall have from me, as her fortune, five hundred pounds; and upon *this* &c'. By such arrangement the 'pounds' get their desired place of emphasis, and the propriety of 'this' is unimpeachable.

'His skill in the art of composition surpassed his knowledge of the world; but *that* too was far from perfection'. 'That' refers to the more distant antecedent, 'his skill in the art of composition'. 'This' (preceded by a different conjunction so as to make good sense) would refer to the nearer antecedent 'his knowledge of the world'.

Not unfrequently, however, 'it' and 'this' or 'that' appear in the same sentence or in successive sentences, with reference to infinitives or to clauses. Hence a great gain in variety, and especially in distinctness.

'The bulk of the people, *it* is true, were degraded by servitude, but *this* had no connection with feudal tenures'. Both pronouns refer, each in its own way, to the statement—'the bulk of the people were degraded by servitude'. 'This' seems to take the firmer hold of the statement referred to. The reference of 'this' might also be to the noun 'servitude'.

'*It* was not possible to break the enemy's line without running on board one of their ships. Hardy informed Nelson of *this*'. 'It' is prospective to the infinitive phrase 'to break &c.'; 'this' is retrospective to the whole assertion—'It was not possible to break . . . ships'. It is well to employ different pronouns for the different purposes.

'*It* may be quite true that many farmers personally dislike gamekeepers, but what of *that?*' 'It' refers forward, 'that' refers backward, to the same clause, 'that many farmers . . . gamekeepers'. By the substitution of 'it' for 'that', ambiguity would not be incurred but the question would be rendered tame; by the use of 'that' the speaker lays his finger on the very point at issue.

'Men at Rome often spoke of making Britain a Roman province; but *it* was not till a good many years after Cæsar's time that *this* was really done'. The forward reference of 'it' to the noun clause 'that this was really done', separates 'this' considerably from the matter it refers back to, 'making Britain a Roman province'. The use of different pronouns for the different references is well enough; but we are tempted to simplify the statement thus—'but *this* was not really done till a good many years, &c'. 'This' is now in more appropriate closeness to its antecedent.

The use of 'that' and 'this' to recall, without repetition of the actual names, two individuals previously mentioned, is for the most part confined to poetry. Several equivalent pairs are given in the Grammar. (ADJECTIVE, § 4.)

Pitt, in one of his great speeches on Ireland, exclaims—'I will not barter English commerce for Irish slavery; *that* is not the price I would pay, nor is *this* the thing I would purchase'. The hearer would have some difficulty in making out the references. A more explicit form would be—'I will not barter English commerce for Irish slavery; I will not pay the price, and I will not buy the article'. Or 'I will not give away English commerce to get in return Irish slavery'.

'Virtue and vice are before you; *this* leads to misery, *that*

to peace'. 'This' is the nearer, the last-mentioned—'vice': 'that' is the more distant, the first-mentioned—'virtue'.

'Some place the bliss in action, some in ease,
Those call it pleasure, and contentment *these*'.

'Those' are the first, the persons that 'place the bliss in action'; 'these' are the last, such as 'place the bliss in ease'.

'This' and 'that' often occur—especially in poetry—without reference to individuals previously mentioned. In such cases we must fall back for explanation upon the simple pointing out of individuals as nearer to or remoter from the speaker.

'*This* racks the joints, *this* fires the veins,
That every labouring sinew strains,
Those in the deeper vitals rage'.

The description supposes the speaker as looking on and pointing successively to two individuals near him, then to one more distant, and finally to others also more distant than the two first.

'The busy sylphs surround their darling care,
These set the head, and *those* divide the hair,
Some fold the sleeve, while others plait the gown'.

'These' and 'those' are much the same in meaning as 'some' and 'others' in the next line; only they are more vivid, as they suppose the speaker pointing out the individuals, and marking the position of these as nearer to or remoter from himself.

The idiom 'THAT OF' borrowed from the French, is very convenient in our language. It saves the repetition of nouns in a particular well-known arrangement, and is most extensively used. The disadvantage of it is the superseding of native forms that are more agreeable to our ear. Moreover, the keeping up of the native forms conduces to greater variety of style; the tendency of all very marked idioms is to monotony.

'I need not make selections from a speech so well-known as *that of* Pym on the trial of Strafford'. This represents a

class of cases where the form is unnecessary; our possessive case being applicable—'a speech so well known as *Pym's*'.

'Such a character as *that of* Frederick'—'as Frederick's'. In this instance, we may by an allowable ellipsis, say simply, 'such a character as Frederick'.

'The eloquence of Cicero was superior to *that of* Cæsar'. 'Cicero's eloquence surpassed Cæsar's'. Another good variety: 'In eloquence, Cicero surpassed Cæsar'; still better, 'Cæsar was surpassed by Cicero'.

'If we compare the writings of Aristotle with *those of* Plato': 'if we compare Aristotle's writings with Plato's'; 'if we compare Aristotle with Plato, in their writings'.

'If we compare the brain of the sheep with *that of* the dog': 'if we compare the sheep's brain with the dog's'; 'if we compare the sheep and the dog, as to their brain'.

'The song of the nightingale is more various than *that of* the thrush'—the nightingale's, the thrush's. 'In variety of song, the nightingale excels the thrush'.

'The agency of light is distinct from *that of* sound'. 'Light acts (operates) in a way different from sound'.

'The general view which Plato gives of Astronomical science is diametrically opposed to *that of* Socrates'. 'In the mode of viewing Astronomical science generally, Plato is diametrically opposed to Socrates'.

'The pleasures of the imagination, taken in their full extent, are not so gross as *those of* sense, nor so refined as *those of* the understanding'. 'As to its pleasures (or, as a source of pleasure) the imagination is not so gross as the senses, nor so refined as the understanding'.

'All sensations are reducible to *those of* Touch'. We might omit the pronoun—'reducible to Touch'. In such an important statement, we should not be wrong in repeating the noun.

'The number of bodies yearly exposed in the Morgue is about 300, of which five-sixths are *(those of)* males'; or 'the bodies of males'.

'In the next department, *that of* pottery'. Here we need nothing but a comma or a dash: 'In the next department

—pottery'. If anything else is needed for this case, it is one of the phrases—'namely', 'that is', 'that is to say', 'to wit' (old-fashioned), 'viz.'

'The course of history is like *(that of)* a great river wandering through various countries'.

'When Milton compares Satan's appearance, after his fall, to *(that of)* the sun suffering an eclipse——'.

'The action proposed to be celebrated was *(that of)* Æneas's settling himself in Latium'.

'In the eleventh century, as now, the dominant Teuton knew himself by no name but *(that of)* Englishman, and was known to his Celtic neighbours by no name but *(that of)* Saxon'.

'The common conception of an army of fanatics is *(that of)* an army mad for one set of tenets'.

'When the Parliament had met, Pym was the first to rise. We know his appearance from his portrait—a portly form which a court waiting-woman called *that of* an ox'. Say—'compared to an ox'.

There are many sentences where the expression 'that of' helps out a comparison. In these cases, we should seek the aid of the balanced structure, so as to place in corresponding positions the individuals that are compared. A few examples will show the advantage of repeating either the noun itself or some synonymous word.

'*The knights of England* found worthy rivals in *the knights of France*'. '*Those* of France' would overturn the balance.

'The history of a battle is not unlike *the history* of a ball'; not '*that* of a ball'.

'The face of justice is like *the face* of the god Janus'.

'The King's troops at first fought better than *those of* the Parliament'. Substitute the synonym 'adherents': 'than *the adherents* of the Parliament'. Or simply—'*the Parliamentarians*'.

The modes of varying the form of the sentence would not

be easily exhausted. One or two further examples are added.

'Their dress and character seemed *those* of merchants of a higher class'. 'From their dress and character they seemed merchants of a higher class'

'His dress was *that* of a shepherd'. Alternative forms: 'His dress was *the dress* of a shepherd'—'a shepherd's'. 'He was dressed like a shepherd', 'he wore a shepherd's dress'.

'Though he talked like a man of sense, his actions were *those* of a fool'. 'He acted like a fool'.

Though the pronoun 'that' takes an adjunct most usually in the form of the preposition-and-noun phrase, this is not its only form of adjunct. The participle or participial phrase is not uncommon, and the adjective clause is familiar to us through the awkward combination 'that which', 'those which'.

'John's plan is simpler than *that adopted by you*'. 'That' is here burdened with a participial apposition. A lighter form would be—'than *yours*'.

'There was a great contrast between the scene we had just left, and *that which we now entered upon*'. A clause is hung upon 'that'. It would be preferable to repeat the noun, and improve the balance: 'The scene we had just left contrasted strongly with the scene we now entered upon'.

'The specimens of this year are inferior to *those exhibited in former years*': another participial adjunct. It is scarcely worth while to establish the balance. We might stop at 'inferior' without perceptible loss.

'That' is frequently used in the absolute way for 'the thing', 'the object', 'the individual', to be pointed out definitely by a restrictive expression immediately following. This expression is perhaps oftenest an adjective clause, though other forms are also more or less common.

'What' often covers conveniently both relative and antecedent. '*That which* we have seen and heard'—'*what*

we have seen', &c. 'I tell you *that which* [= *what*] you yourselves do know'.

'*Those who think* must govern *those that toil*'. Here the aid of 'what' is not available. 'Those' stands absolutely for 'the persons', and these are quite unknown till the accompanying clause explains.

This usage is common to 'that' with the ordinary demonstratives.

In the following example from Jeremy Taylor 'they' is simply a variety for the same meaning as 'those': 'Anger is troublesome, not only to *those* that suffer it, but to *them* that behold it'.

The INDEFINITE DEMONSTRATIVE pronouns are employed when it is desirable to state an action without precisely naming the subject. The chief members of the class are 'They' and 'One'.

'They,' is not of equal importance with 'one'. It is most usually found in connection with verbs of saying, telling, &c.: '*They* say—*they* tell me—that there is no danger'. 'They' stands for whoever expresses an opinion on the matter: it is the popular voice.

This use is mostly familiar and conversational. In more serious composition, other forms are sought to give relief: 'There *is said* to be no danger' *(passive voice)*, 'I hear there is no danger', 'No danger is apprehended', &c. 'One' does not readily take the place of 'they' in such instances.

Here may be classed such examples as the following: 'At Vienna *they* were not altogether displeased at the King's landing in Germany'. 'They' is not quite definite; probably 'the government', 'the authorities', are meant. 'In Germany *they* manage things better': that is, whoever has the management. It might be held an equivalent to say—'*The Germans* manage things better': or, by the passive voice, 'Things *are managed* better in Germany'.

'*One* cannot be too careful'. The speaker means to state a general fact; as if he had said—'*People* cannot——'. The

remark is applicable to everybody, and yet it points to no one in particular.

This pronoun continually lands writers in difficulties. English idiom requires that, when the pronoun has to be again referred to, it should be used itself a second time. The correct usage is shown by Pope: '*One* may be ashamed to consume half *one's* day's in bringing sense and rhyme together.' It would be against idiom to say 'half *his* days'.

Still the repetition of the pronoun is often felt to be heavy, and writers have recourse to various substitutions. Even an ear accustomed to the idiom can scarcely accept with unmixed pleasure this instance from Browning:—

> 'Alack! *one* lies *oneself*
> Even in the stating that *one's* end was truth,
> Truth only, if *one* states so much in words'.

The representative 'I' or 'we', as already mentioned (p. 38), occasionally acts the part of 'one'. The following sentence presents a curious alternation of 'we' with 'one'—possibly not accidental (George Eliot): 'It's a desperately vexatious thing, that after all *one's* reflections and quiet determinations, *we* should be ruled by moods that *one* can't calculate on beforehand'. By the use of 'we' here, a more pointed reference is suggested, while the vagueness actually remains.

Fenimore Cooper, like Scott, is not very particular; an example may be quoted: 'Modesty is a poor man's wealth; but as *we* grow substantial in the world, patroon, *one* can afford to begin to speak truth of *himself* as well as of *his* neighbour'. Were Cooper a careful writer, we might persuade ourselves that he chose 'we' and 'one' with a purpose: 'we' might indicate that the speaker had himself and the patroon directly in his eye, although at the same time he wanted to put it generally; and 'one' might hint that modesty succeeded in getting the better of him. But 'himself' and 'his' would alone show that such speculations are too refined for the occasion.

The form 'a man', which was at one time common, seems

to be reviving. In 'Adam Bede' we have: '*A man* can never do anything at variance with his own nature'. We might substitute 'one'.

'Men' was more frequent in good writing formerly than now. 'Neither do *men* light a candle, and put it under a bushel'. 'Do *men* gather grapes of thorns?' Hume is fond of expressing a general subject by 'men'.

The occasional use of 'you' in familiar composition, to express the general statement with some vividness, has been already noticed. (p. 40.)

'Small birds are much more exposed to the cold than large *ones*'. This usage is hardly 'indefinite': and it needs no further exemplification.

RELATIVE PRONOUNS.

I here append additional examples of the distinctive uses of the relative pronouns; employing 'that' for restriction, and 'who', 'which', for co-ordination.

Various substitutes that may on occasion be desirable for one purpose or another, will be noticed incidentally. These are of the utmost importance; seeing that compositions of all kinds are exceedingly apt to be overburdened with relative constructions, and especially with the proper relatives.

The *co-ordinating* use of 'who' and 'which' is seen when the antecedent is completely expressed and known without the help of the clause introduced by the relative. This relative clause simply adds in a convenient form farther information concerning an individual already definitely pointed out. The relative itself points to the individual in question, and has also a varying connective power: it may, accordingly, be replaced by a personal or a demonstrative pronoun and a conjunction.

The typical cases of the co-ordinating use are when the conjunction that may be substituted is of the co-ordinating class. 'The other man, *whose* business was to communicate with Charnock, was a ruffian named Chambers, *who* had

served in the Irish army'. The relative clauses are here co-ordinate: they add further knowledge of the individuals referred to, these being held as previously described in full. 'And his', 'and he' might be substituted for 'whose' and 'who'. Again: 'The Royal power was in conflict with two enemies: the feudal independence of the nobles, *which* it wished to destroy; and the growing municipal freedom of the great cities, *which* it wished to curb'. 'Which' is the same as 'and it (this, that)'—a co-ordinating conjunction and a demonstrative pronoun.

The same explanations apply in the following examples: 'This curious design I bought of a nun in France, *who* passed years in toil upon the conceit, *which* is of more value than the material'. 'We had the satisfaction not only of preserving the poor fellow's leg, but likewise of rendering the doctor contemptible among the ship's company, *who* had all their eyes on us during the course of this cure, *which* was completed in six weeks'.

The conjunction to substitute is sometimes of the Subordinating class. The relative clause is then adverbial in nature; and the classing of such instances under the Co-ordinating head may seem to involve a contradiction. But co-ordination is here contrasted, not with *sub*ordination, but with *restriction*. And the examples in question are for the most part clauses expressing reason or cause, explanation, concession; which, though logically subordinate, are often held important enough to be entitled to a separate statement in apparent co-ordination. The cases thus sufficiently resemble typical co-ordinating cases to be classed along with these in contrast with the cases of restriction. These latter, as we shall see, may be occasionally resolved in a curiously similar manner: the conjunction being of the Conditional class.

'It is strange that he should have been ungrateful to you, *who* did so much for him'. The kind of connection established by 'who' might be given, in the resolved form, thus: 'after you—since you—seeing (considering) that you—did so much for him'. The substitution is a subordinating con-

junction and a personal pronoun. Similarly with 'which': 'He insisted on building another house, *which* he had no use for'. That is—'*although* he had no use for *it*'.

'Murray's enemies in Scotland, *who* were both numerous and powerful, comprised two parties: the friends of the old Church, *who* were anxious for the restoration of Mary; and the House of Hamilton, *who* were jealous of Murray's great power'. In none of these cases does the relative clause limit more strictly an antecedent that is but partially defined; the antecedents are fully described already. The first 'who' is a typical case of co-ordination; in the two other cases, a cause is assigned, or, to say the least, an explanation suggested.

Thus far 'who' and 'which' are similarly used: 'who' referring to persons, like 'I', 'thou', 'he', 'she'; 'which' making the other references, like 'it', 'this', 'that'. We have now to notice a peculiar use of 'which', common to it with the corresponding demonstratives just enumerated—the reference to a preceding infinitive phrase or noun clause, expressed or implied: 'We shall have the governess in a day or two, *which* will be a great satisfaction'. 'Which' is the same as 'and it (this, that)', namely, 'that we shall have the governess' (noun clause), or 'having the governess' (infinitive phrase). Many of the examples under the demonstratives could be cited for illustrating this usage.

When the relative clause is needed to point out definitely the otherwise unknown, or vaguely suggested, antecedent, it is said to be restrictive; and the introducing relative pronoun is then said to be restrictive. For this purpose, the satisfactory pronoun is 'that'. A few simple examples will bring home the usage clearly: 'I have something *that* will suit you'; 'this is the house *that* Jack built'; 'blessings on the man *that* invented sleep'; 'cats *that* wear gloves catch no mice'.

We cannot here, as in the co-ordinating use, strike out the relative clause and yet leave a satisfying sense. We hear the statement, and are then ready to demand further —'*what* sort of thing?' '*what* house?' '*what* man?'

'*which* cats?' And the sense is entirely in abeyance, uselessly incomplete, or different from what is intended, until the introduction of the modifying clause.

Here it may be remarked, in passing, that the restrictive relative may sometimes be resolved, after the manner of the co-ordinating relatives, into a conjunction and a demonstrative pronoun. The conjunction is mostly, if not always, of the strictly *conditional* class (subordinating). 'Cats *that* wear gloves catch no mice' may be resolved thus: 'Cats, *if they* wear gloves, catch no mice'; 'Cats, *when they* wear gloves, &c.'—'when' being practically conditional. But these resolutions are never quite satisfactory equivalents, the extent of the subject not remaining precisely the same.

Many good writers use 'who' and 'which', as well as 'that', for the restrictive meaning. But this mixture of usages should be discouraged; and 'that' should be put forward as the sole proper representative of restriction. We might urge the variety attainable by this distinction; but the great argument for the separation of functions is the avoidance of ambiguity.

The following examples will shew that the danger is not imaginary or slight:—

'It is requested that all members of Council, *who* are also members of the Lands Committee, will assemble in the Council-room.' This might mean that all the members of the Council are members of the Lands Committee; the real meaning is expressed beyond a doubt by 'that'; it might also be expressed by '*such* members as'.

'The volume may be cordially and confidently recommended to all geologists *to whom* the Secondary rocks of England are a subject of interest.' The author probably intends to restrict 'all geologists', but he signifies that they are all interested in the Secondary rocks. There would be no mistake if the relative were 'that', or 'such as'; 'all geologists *that* take an interest in the Secondary rocks of England'.

'The Fellows *who*, in conformity with their oaths, had refused to submit to this usurper, had been driven forth

from their quiet cloisters and gardens'. It would be somewhat hazardous to affirm whether the writer means that *all* the Fellows had refused to submit and had consequently been driven forth, or whether only a part of them had. The first sense might be indicated by a comma after 'Fellows'. The second sense would be brought out clearly and unmistakeably by 'that'.

The advantage of the idiomatic distinction comes out when we consider such a slovenly abuse of 'which' as the following: 'The peace *which* was now made, *which* is known as the Peace of Westphalia, made some important changes in Europe'. The first 'which' is restrictive, the second co-ordinating. This awkward clash might be obviated: 'the peace (*that* was) now made'.

The next example will strike the most careless reader: 'Next in importance to the Aryans we must place those *which* are called the Semitic nations, among *whom* those with *whom* we have most concern are the Hebrews, the Phœnicians, and the Arabs'. 'Which' is restrictive, the clause selecting a smaller class; the first 'whom' is co-ordinating, the antecedent being already fully known and expressed; the second 'whom' is restrictive, a particular set being indicated. The double use of the demonstrative 'those' combines with the use of the relatives to make the sentence oppressively heavy. Besides, the transition from 'which' to 'whom' is rather disrespectful to the recognized usage of the pronouns. The mere substitution of 'that' would do little to lighten such composition as this: 'Next in importance to the Aryans we must place (those which are called) the Semitic nations, among whom (those with whom) we have most concern (are) with the Hebrews, &c.'.

While 'who' and 'which' are very common, especially in books, in the restrictive sense, 'that', on the other hand, has never been much used in the co-ordinating sense for 'who' or 'which'. It can never act for 'which' in referring to a preceding infinitive or clause. A few examples may be quoted.

In Hamlet, we have 'the cock, *that* is the trumpet to the morn'; the meaning would be more properly given by 'which'.

'Has not your sister here, *that* never disobliged me in her life, as good a right as you?' Goldsmith should have written 'who'; the antecedent is fully given. It might be supposed that, if the meaning in the writer's mind were fully given, the expression would stand thus: 'Has not your sister here, *one* (or 'a person') *that* &c.'. But this speculation is hazardous. See also below.

Thackeray occasionally affects this usage. 'Harry remained with his regiment *that* was garrisoned in Brussels'. According to the general use of 'that', we should understand that Harry had a plurality of regiments, a particular one of the number being selected here. Again: 'The disposition for attack was completed under a severe fire from the enemy's guns, (*that*) 'which' were better posted and more numerous than ours'.

The frequent use of 'that' after a personal pronoun is very notable. 'I *that* speak unto thee, am he.' Here we are almost under the necessity of supplying mentally a noun placed in apposition to 'I' and limited or defined by the relative clause following: 'I, *(the man) that* speaks unto thee, am he'. The person of the verb would be changed in deference to the expressed pronominal antecedent: '*I* that *speak*'. So: 'Thou *that* wast seal'd in thy nativity the slave of nature, &c'. 'Wast' stands in the way of the supposition of an ellipsis: we cannot say 'thou *(a man)* that *wast* seal'd'. Still, on the formal suppression of the real antecedent, the verb 'was' would bend to the superior attraction of the apparent and expressed antecedent: '*Thou* that *wast*'.

Further examples:

'I *that* did never weep now melt in woe'.

'And will she yet debase her eyes on *me*,
That cropp'd the golden prime of this sweet prince,
And made her widow to a woful bed?

On *me*, *whose* all not equals Edward's moiety?
On *me*, *that* halt and am mis-shapen thus?'

Rich. III.

The correct form appears in the following: 'I, *who* know that enemy well, cannot think of such a battle without dismay'.

After a SUPERLATIVE, 'that' should be used. Not 'he was the *first* person *who* discovered', but 'the first person *that* discovered'. A shorter form is allowed—'the first to discover'. Few grammarians would now support 'which' as comparable to 'that' in this usage.

'The Romans were the *best* soldiers and the *wisest* lawmakers *that* the world ever saw'.

'The *first* protector *whom* ('that') the English found among the dominant caste was Archbishop Anselm'.

Macaulay speaks of 'the two *greatest* and *most salutary* revolutions *(which)* 'that' have taken place in England'.

'Murder, therefore, is the most atrocious of all crimes, *which* affect individuals only, in the sight both of mankind and of the person *who* has committed it'. 'Of all crimes *that* affect individuals only, murder is the most atrocious, both in the sight of mankind, and in the sight of him *that* has committed it'—'in the sight of the murderer's self'.

'Brown's Inquiry into Cause and Effect is one of the most valuable contributions to science (for *which* we are indebted) '*that* we owe' to the last generation'.

In the following construction, somewhat resembling the superlative, 'that' is also to be preferred. 'Man is the ONLY animal *(which)* 'that' can combine sociality with solitude'; or, shorter thus—'the only animal able to unite sociality and solitude'. More concrete—'the only animal that can live either sociable or solitary'.

'Adrian IV. was the *only* Englishman *that* ever sat in the papal chair'.

After 'ALL' a strong restriction is desirable. 'The higher and middle classes have been too anxious to take their

children out of *all* employments *(which)* 'that' have anything mechanical in them'. This might have been 'all mechanical employments' but for the desire to put stress on the word 'mechanical', which is done by the use of a clause. The effect would be still better thus: 'employments that have in them anything mechanical' [the emphatic word thrown to the end]; or, 'employments (in) anywise mechanical'.

'All *that* live must die'.

'I made him a present of *all* the good sermons *(which)* 'that' have been printed in English'.

After a NEGATIVE, the purely restrictive 'that' should be used. 'There are *no* races *in respect of which* the preceding observations do not apply'. Otherwise; '*but* (*that* do *not*) come under the preceding observations'.

'No man *who* has written so much is so seldom tiresome': 'that' is preferable.

'He wrote on no subject *which* he did not enrich with valuable thought'. '*That* he did not enrich'; or, '*but* he enriched'; or, 'without enriching it'.

> 'For there was *never* yet philosopher
> 'That could endure the toothache patiently'.

The same strong restriction is appropriate in other cases that are more or less similar.

'There is *scarce* a poet or historian among the Roman authors of those times, *whom* he has not translated in Sejanus and Catiline'. More satisfactorily: '*that* he has not translated', or, '*but* he has translated'.

So: 'Ben Jonson managed his strength to more advantage than *any who* preceded him'. Rather—'any *that* preceded him'.

'If there be any other substitutes, of *which* I am not aware'. Very ambiguous: it may mean—'I am not aware whether or not there are any other substitutes'; and also, 'If there be *any* other substitutes *that* I do not know of'.

For the first meaning—'If there be any other substitutes, *and* I do not know whether there be or not'.

'WHOSE' stands as a possessive form for both the restrictive use and the co-ordinating use. It should not be employed when there is any danger of ambiguity: other modes of expression may readily be found. The old rule that 'whose' applies only to persons, is altogether at variance with literary usage.

One or two co-ordinating examples of 'whose' have already been brought in incidentally. 'The Knight exchanged Balisarda for a less deadly sword, *of which* he carefully blunted the point and edge'—'*whose* point and edge'. Co-ordinating reference to a thing.

'Those classes *of which* the inclinations are generally on the side of order and authority, were eager to promote popular reforms'. The expression is lightened thus: '*The* classes *whose* inclinations are &c.'.

'Christ expressly told Pilate that his kingdom was one, the members *of which* did not fight'. The composition is more firmly knit thus: 'his kingdom was one *whose* members did not fight'.

'Thrice is he armed *that* hath his quarrel just;
And he but naked, though locked up in steel,
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted.'
'Thou hast been
As one, in suffering all, *that* suffers nothing,
A man *that* fortune's buffets and rewards
Hast ta'en with equal thanks: and blest are those
Whose blood and judgment are so well commingled
That &c.'

An exceedingly important substitution is seen in many of the cases where the relative pronoun joins with a preposition to make up an adverbial phrase. This adverbial phrase may often be replaced by a *relative adverb*, co-ordinating or restrictive.

'The place (*in which*) 'where' the impeachment of War-

ren Hastings was conducted was worthy of such a trial'. This is superior even to the form—'The place *that* the impeachment was conducted *in*'.

'The only navigable channel ran very near to the left bank, *where* (= *on which*) the headquarters of the enemy had been fixed, and *where* (= *on which*) the batteries were most numerous.'

'I have given thee a faithful history of my travels, *wherein* (= *in which*) I have not been so studious of ornament as of truth'.

'That great city, *(on which)* 'whereon' the whole duchy depends, would have opened its gates.'

'We see the ground *whereon* these woes do lie'. With the proper restrictive relative, we should say—'*that* these woes do lie *on*'. Either is preferable to '*on which*'.

'It was necessary to find some new mode *by which* the charges of the war might be defrayed': or 'some new mode *whereby* the charges might be defrayed'. Also, more simply, 'some new mode *of defraying* the charges'.

'The night cometh, *when* no man can work'. This is elegant for '*in which, during which* no man can work'.

'None can venture to fix the precise moment (*at which*) 'when' either distinction ceased.'

'A soldier pierced his side, *whence* (*from which*) there issued blood and water'.

'The police actively sought for the dens *from which* so much treason proceeded'. 'The dens *that* so much treason proceeded *from*'; or '*whence* so much treason proceeded'.

'He hurries towards Madrid to solicit mercy; *whither* (or *to which, towards which*) also other messengers were hurrying on the like errand'.

'BUT' *as a relative.* For a negative restriction, this is a very emphatic form. The following are examples. 'There is no moral rule (which) 'that' does not bend to circumstances.' Say—'*but* bends to circumstances'. 'There is no conceivable object of vision *(which is not)* '*but* is' coloured'.

'There is no man that hath left house, or parents,——— (*who* shall *not*) 'but' shall receive——'.

'There was not a regiment *which* he did *not* inspect with minute attention'; ——'*but* he inspected'.

'Who is there *that* would *not* pity them?'——'Who (is there) *but* would pity them?' The interrogation has the force of a negative statement.

In many instances a pronoun is brought in along with 'but': more especially a demonstrative. With 'but' alone there is no apparent subject, object, &c.

'There's ne'er a villain dwelling in all Denmark
But he's an arrant knave'.

The 'he' is quite unnecessary. With this example the following may be compared: 'On the bench of justice he declared that there was not one heretic in forty thousand *who* was *not* a villain'. In so strong a statement, the most forcible as well as most elegant construction is—'There was not one heretic in forty thousand *but* was a villain'. Not 'but *he*'.

'There was never yet fair woman *but she* made mouths in a glass'. The 'she' is not needed. 'But' gives a neat alternation for '*that* did *not* make mouths'.

'There was not a bay or a haven *but it* was freer to our forefathers than to the natives'. 'It' may be dispensed with.

'There's not a one of them *but* in *his* house
I keep a servant fee'd'.

Here the inserted pronoun is in the possessive. The ordinary form is scarcely so energetic: 'not (a) one of them in *whose* house I (do) *not* keep a servant fee'd'.

'Scarce a skull's cast up
But well he knew *its* owner'.

For—'*whose* owner he knew *not* well'.

Sometimes a relative is found: 'If he landed, what would he find? An open country; . , . not a river *but which* could be forded'. Such an example points pretty clearly to the original ellipsis

'As' is the common relative after 'such', and is not unfrequent after 'same'. This construction, like the last mentioned, is the result of a great ellipsis. 'Such—as' is a most useful interchange with 'those (the) that', 'they that', &c.

'Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially *they who* labour in the word and doctrine'. The proper relative here is the restrictive 'that'. The form 'those that' might also be used for 'they that'; but the best form is perhaps 'especially *such as* labour'.

'The inhabitants of Gaul, especially in *those* parts *which* lie contiguous to Italy, had acquired some refinement. 'That' is the proper relative here. '*Those* parts *that* lie contiguous' might be smoothed down to '*the* parts *that*'. '*Such* parts *as* lie contiguous' might also be used. '*The* parts [lying] contiguous to Italy' would, however, be quite sufficient.

'The soldier was then subject to exactly the *same* law *which* governed the citizen'. The idiomatic relative would be 'that' 'the *same* law *that* governed'. The recurrence of the proper relative may be avoided by the use of 'as': 'the same law *as* governed the citizen'.

'The Welsh did not keep Easter on the *same* day *that* the rest of the Western Churches did'. 'That' is idiomatic: we may also give 'the *same* day *as*'.

Examples of earlier constructions after 'such' are reserved in the meantime (see p. 83). We shall first cite a number of miscellaneous examples, illustrative of various points.

'Of the manner *in which* we judge of other men': 'Of the way *that* we judge of other men'; 'of *our* manner *of judging*'. 'The manner *in which*' is cumbrous and unnecessary, as well as at variance with the restrictive meaning. 'The manner *wherein*——' would be felt as too weighty and formal for the occasion.

'A paralytic limb is a limb (the movement *of which*) '*whose* movement' is not consequent upon *(that)* '*the*' mental state *(which)* '*that*' is usually followed by such a

movement'. Or—'A limb that is paralysed does not move in response to the mental states that usually cause movement of the body.'

'Mental power, even when abused, is a nobler and better power than *that which* consists merely in corporeal strength.' 'Than *the* power *that* consists'; 'than *what* consists'; 'than *such* power *as* consists'; most elegantly, 'than mere corporeal strength'.

'Aristotle says, virtue is the law of our nature, under which we are born'. Better, 'virtue is the law of our nature, (*and*) under *that law* were we born'. The relative here is inadequate for emphasis; and we need to resolve it into its equivalent demonstrative and conjunction. (See Grammar, p. 193, § 14.)

'Several of the Emperors wished to take away all images and pictures out of the churches, *which* the Popes did not wish to have done'. At first sight 'which' might be mentally referred to 'churches' or 'images and pictures'; and it is not till we reach the end of the sentence that we see that the reference is to neither of these, but to the 'taking away' of them. The remedy is—'*and this*—' or '*but this*—'.

'He is a man of real energy, and who flies at high game'. Two restrictions are here made upon 'a man', but they are incongruously expressed. The 'and' is meant to couple the adverbial phrase—'of real energy'—remnant of a clause 'that possesses real energy'—and the relative clause; but from its position we suppose it connects the relative clause with the principal. 'He is a man of real energy, and one that flies at high game'. Or make the two clauses co-ordinate—'He is a man of real energy, and flies at high game'.

The restrictive relative does not apply well when a noun is already qualified even by an adjective. 'By this process we come at last to a highest genus *that cannot be defined*'. If the relative clause stood alone it would be correct, as it is meant to limit 'genus'; but 'genus' is already limited by 'highest', and 'that cannot be defined' is co-ordinate with that limited class. It might, therefore, be 'which cannot be defined', or 'a highest genus, one that is indefinable'.

Once more—'a highest genus, *a genus that* cannot be defined', the noun being repeated to take on an adjective clause explanatory of the first and equivalent description 'highest'.

'No education can entitle to the appellation—a Poet, a dull and unobservant mind,' or one, though neither dull nor unobservant, *in which* the channels of communication between thought and expression have been obstructed or closed'. Much better here to convert 'a dull and unobservant mind' into the clause 'a mind that is dull and unobservant'. The 'in which' cannot be resolved into *that—in*, without an extreme separation of the preposition from the relative. For such instances, I should prefer the adverbial relative 'where', or 'wherein'; but most people would refuse to make a change.

'There are some attributes expressed by general words, of *which* this may seem more doubtful'. Restriction is here the meaning, but we could scarcely substitute 'that' for 'which'. For one thing, 'that' as a relative prefers a close antecedent, and would be most readily connected with 'general words'. For another thing, the restrictions 'some', and 'expressed by general words' narrow the class to the area intended; and of that narrow class, the clause 'this may seem more doubtful' is spoken. To couple clauses with phrases on an equal footing is always awkward; and the best remedy is to change the structure. 'This may seem more doubtful regarding certain attributes expressed by general words'.

'Breathes there a man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said—?'—(Scott.)

By putting 'that' for *who* we should have the restrictive relative for 'man', were it not for the phrase 'with soul so dead', which stops the way. There is here the awkwardness just mentioned of coupling a phrase with a clause. What is worse, the 'so' needs something to follow, and can be satisfied only with the clause '*as* never to have said to himself', or 'as that *he* never to himself hath said'. Otherwise we must view the phrase 'with soul so dead', as a loose

parenthesis; it is not common to use 'so' as an adverb of intensity without 'as' to follow.

'But he trusted there was not a wretch *so* base and mean-spirited to be found in the kingdom, *who* would accept them upon the conditions *on which* they must be offered'. (Swift.) 'But he trusted there was not to be found in the kingdom a wretch *so* base and mean-spirited *as to accept* them on the conditions *that* they must be offered *on*'; or simply 'the conditions *that* must be offered'. About the time of Elizabeth, this construction—the relative preceded by 'so'—was very far from uncommon; Shakespeare has it frequently:

> 'But no perfection is *so* absolute,
> *That* some impurity doth not pollute'.

Mätzner mentions that the adjective clause sometimes appears in the place of a clause (adverbial) with 'that' or 'as' with infinitive: '*so* sanguine *that he did not apprehend*' or '*so* sanguine *as not to apprehend*'. After giving two examples, the one we have just quoted from Scott, and one from Swift like the foregoing, he remarks that 'Recent Grammarians take offence at this kind of sentence' ('Neuere Grammatiker nehmen an Satzen dieser Art . . . Anstosz'). But, he goes on to say, this construction was in earlier authors ('früher'), after a negative, or after a question (as Scott's example), a favourite form of expression ('eine beliebte Ausdrucksweise'). And he quotes plentifully from Chaucer, Layamon, &c. He does not give any example from Elizabethan times, or indeed mention them; yet, in this period, the usage is continuously kept up.

'The energy and exaltation of character (which) 'that' revolutions call forth are paid for in the lassitude, the depression, the political infidelity, (which) 'that' ensue.'

'The faculties *which* are necessary for the conduct of important business ripened in him at a time of life *when* they have scarcely begun to blossom in ordinary men'. Better 'the faculties (*that* are) necessary'. 'When' is very elegantly substituted for '*at which*'; or for '*that*———men *at*'. The last would be intolerable, owing to the great

distance between the relative and the preposition. In such statements of time, the preposition is often omitted.

'The scene had quite changed in the half-hour *that* Adam had been in the garden.' At the end of all we should expect a preposition, to go along with 'that'; say 'in' or 'during'. That the separated preposition should drop off is not unnatural. 'During which' for 'that' would be heavy and unidiomatic.

'The time *that* Britain remained a Roman province was between three and four hundred years.' A similar explanation applies here.

An example already quoted illustrates the omission of the preposition: 'The Welsh did not keep Easter on the same day *that* the rest of the Western Churches did' (kept Easter *on*).

When the meaning is not time, the omission is less common. The following is a poetical example:

> 'A perfect judge will read each work of wit
> With the same spirit *that* its author writ' [*with*].

The sense is restrictive, and 'with which' is not desirable. 'Wherewith', an old adverbial form, is not now in frequent use.

'Here is a pair of propositions (which) 'that' can never be asserted of the same instance, (and of which) 'while yet' in many instances neither can apply'. These are subordinate clauses qualifying the principal; the second relative being governed by 'of' cannot be converted to 'that'; but the conjunction 'while yet' not merely serves to unite the second clause with the first, but indicates the mode of connection, that being more than simple cumulation by 'and'.

'But he can only hope to attain this by lowering his pattern to (that pitch in which) 'the point where' the spectators are capable of going along with him.' ['Only' should be placed before 'by lowering.']

'We shall briefly run over the events *which* attended the conquest made by that empire'. 'The events *attending* the

conquest'—using the participle: or, still more simply, 'the events *of* the conquest'.

'In these classes of things, *which* are those with *which* Probability is concerned, the fundamental conception *which* the reader has to fix in his mind as clearly as possible, is, I take it, *that of* a series'. The first 'which' is right; the others, besides being brought in for restriction, crowd the sentence with too many whiches. 'In these classes of things, *being* those *that* Probability is concerned with, the fundamental conception *to be fixed* in the reader's mind as clearly as possible, is (that of) a series'.

In continuation, the author writes: 'But it is a series of a particular kind, one of which I can see no better compendious description than (that which) 'what' is given by the statement that it combines individual irregularity with aggregate regularity'. Or—'But it is a series of a particular kind; and I cannot compendiously describe it better than by saying that in it the individuals are irregular and the aggregate regular'.

'In the Solar System, an assemblage of bodies, each (of which has) 'having' its simple and regular motions that severally alternate between two extremes, and the whole (of which has) 'having' its involved perturbations that now increase and now decrease, is presented to us.' Change the order and say, 'In the Solar System is presented to us an assemblage of bodies.'

'There is no better test of a weak understanding than the facility *with which* it is taken in by a truism'; 'than its being easily taken in by a truism'.

'That' is disadvantageous chiefly when there is a preposition. Our idiom allows the preposition to be separated by a considerable interval from the relative: 'unconsidered rivulets (which) 'that' the neighbouring rustics do not even know the names *of*' (Helps). The chief objection made to this form is the want of melody, but an alternative can always be found when the abruptness is serious. Hall says—'great virtues often save, and always illustrate, the

age and nation *in which* they appear'; 'the age and nation *that* they appear *in*', would be harsh: the best substitute is '*wherein* they appear', which adds to the melody.

It has already been seen (p. 78) that the preposition at the end of a relative clause is frequently dropt; the chief cases, in prose, being where the preposition and the relative join to make up a phrase of time.

'That' applies to both persons and things, and hence may be somewhat ambiguous when the antecedent does not express which is meant. This is the case with such antecedents as 'one' and 'all'. Now 'who' decides at once for persons, and 'which' for things. There may be a balance against employing 'that' in such instances. 'Any one *who* never made a blunder'.

It can never be necessary to use *he who*, *the man who*, for restriction. 'Happy the man (who) 'that' sees'. 'To a man (who) 'that' has no capital, (who) 'that' has laid by nothing.' In the following sentence there is a seeming advantage in 'who': 'There are many millions in India *who* would be utterly unable to pay a fine of fifty rupees; there are hundreds of thousands *from whom* such a fine might be levied, but *whom* it would reduce to extreme distress; there are thousands *to whom* it would give very little uneasiness; there are hundreds *to whom* it would be a matter of perfect indifference, and *who* not cross a room to avoid it'. Yet, probably the passage would be improved by so changing it as to admit of the correct restrictive. 'In India, there are many millions of persons *that* could not possibly pay a fine of fifty rupees [for strong negation, 'not' is preferable to the prefix 'un' combined with an adjective]; there are hundreds of thousands of persons *that* such a fine might be levied *from*, but *that* would be reduced by it to extreme distress; there are thousands *that* would suffer from it very little uneasiness; there are hundreds *that* would not cross a room to avoid it' [omit the clause 'it would be a matter of perfect indifference' as a weaker form of what comes after].

When the first of two or more co-ordinate adjective clauses is introduced by 'whose', there might be awkwardness in using 'that' to introduce the second. But even then the structure might be re-arranged so as to restore the proper relative everywhere.

'It has been affirmed that the pedigree of Hastings can be traced back to the great Danish sea-king *whose* sails were long the terror of both coasts of the British Channel, and *who*, after many fierce and doubtful struggles, yielded at last to the valour and genius of Alfred'. 'Whose' can hardly be interfered with successfully; but 'who' may be assimilated by some such substitution as '*whose determined spirit*'.

'We cannot say that we much admire the big man *whose* sword is dug up in one quarter of the globe, *whose* helmet drops from the clouds in another, and *who*, after clattering and rustling for some days, ends by kicking the house down'.

'Horace Walpole spoke of himself as of a man *whose* equanimity was proof to ambitious hopes and fear, *who* had learned to rate power, wealth, and fame, at their true value, and *whom* the conflict of parties, the rise and fall of statesmen, the ebb and flow of public opinion, moved only to a smile of mingled compassion and disdain'.

Again, 'that' cannot take the place of 'who' when the antecedent is suppressed.

'*Who* drives fat oxen should himself be fat.'
'*Who* reasons wisely is not therefore wise.'
'*Who* steals my purse steels trash; . . .
. . . . . .
But *he that* filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him
And makes me poor indeed.'

Nor can 'that' be used in the similar case where the relative clause precedes the formally expressed antecedent.

'*Whom*, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.'

'*Who* cover faults, at last shame them derides.'

In Scriblerus, we have examples of all varieties of restrictive construction :—

'The *Flying Fishes*: These are writers *who* now and then rise upon their fins.

'The *Swallows* are authors *that* are eternally skimming and fluttering up and down.

'The *Ostriches* are *such whose* heaviness rarely permits them [old grammar]—'*such that* their heaviness rarely permits them.' To preserve the relative construction [*such that* &c.—, as amended, being adverbial], say: 'are *such as are rarely permitted*, through (owing to) their heaviness, to ——'; and the like. Further on, this earlier form for 'such—as' will be illustrated by a few examples.

'The *Parrots* are *they that* repeat another's words.

'The *Didappers* are authors *that* keep themselves long out of sight under water.

'The *Frogs* are *such as* can neither walk nor fly, but can leap and bound to admiration.

'The *Eels* are obscure authors, *that* wrap themselves up in their own mud, but are mighty nimble and pert.'

'Such I created all the ethereal Powers
And spirits, both *them who* stood and *them who* fail'd.
Freely *they* stood *who* stood, and fell *who* fell.'

The meaning here is obviously restrictive in every case.

In the following lines 'that' should be 'which':

'——so bent he seems
On desperate revenge, *that* shall redound
Upon his own rebellious head.'

Our translation of St. Matthew's gospel has been examined, for the usage of the several relatives, by Professor Milligan, of Aberdeen, one of the Committee for revising the English Translation of the New Testament. There are 224 relative constructions. Of these, 175 are in strict accordance with the distinctive uses of 'who,' 'which,' and 'that,' as here taught. In 43 cases, 'who' or 'which' is put for 'that'; in 6 cases 'that' is put for 'who' or 'which'. I believe that there is scarcely one of the exceptional con-

structions that would not be felt to be improved by being made to conform with the prevailing usage. And Professor Milligan is of the same opinion.

At one time 'who' was very common after 'such'; 'whose' being used as possessive.

'Let *such* teach others *who* themselves excel,
And censure freely *who* have written well'.—Pope.

'He avoids *such* stories *whose* mention may suggest bad thoughts to the auditors'.—Fuller. We might now say simply '*such* stories *as* may suggest'.

'If thou conquer Rome, the benefit
Which thou shalt thereby reap is *such* a name
Whose repetition will be dogg'd with curses;
Whose chronicle thus writ'.—*Coriol.* v. 3.

The adverbial substitutes are also found after 'such': 'Avoiding *such* mirth *wherein* is abuse'.—Roister Doister, *prologue.*

'If children were brought up, in *soch* a house, or *soch* a Schole, *where* the latin tonge were properlie and perfitlie spoken.'—Ascham, *Scholemaster*, *Arber's Reprint*, *p.* 28.

There is perhaps intentional variety in the following:

'Of old, *those* met rewards *who* could excel,
And *such* were praised *who* but endeavour'd well'.—Pope.

Compare *Hamlet*, III. 4:

'*Such* an act
That blurs the grace and blush of modesty,
. . . . . .
. . . . . O, *such* a deed
As from the body of contraction plucks
The very soul, &c.'.

From the prologue to *Henry VIII.*, may be quoted these alternations:

'those—that,'
'such—as',
'those—that',
'they—that'.

'It is not the voice of *them that* shout for mastery, neither

is it the voice of *them that* cry for being overcome; but the voice of *them that* sing do I hear'.

'For just experience tells, in every soil,
That *those who* think must govern *those that* toil'.

Perhaps the 'who' is used here on account of the 'that' introducing the line.

The restriction of 'who' to persons, and 'which' to other individuals, was not in full force in the Elizabethan period. It was not generally recognized till much later.

'Against the Capitol I met a lion,
Who glared upon me'.—*Julius Cæsar*, I. 3.

'Deep woes roll forward like a gentle flood,
Who, being stopp'd, the bounding banks o'erflows'.
Lucrece, 1118-9.

'A brave vessel,
Who had, no doubt, some noble creature in her'.
Tempest, I. 2.

'———any creature in the vessel
Which thou heard'st cry, *which* thou saw'st sink'.
Tempest, I. 2.

'Our Father *which* art in Heaven'.

'How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, *which* am a woman of Samaria?' . . . 'Art thou greater than our father Jacob, *which* gave us the well?'

And, much later, Dryden says of Ben Jonson:—'I think him the most learned and judicious writer *which* any theatre ever had'.

Dr. Abbott (Shakespearian Grammar) quotes the following as a good illustration of 'the unsettled nature of Elizabethan syntax' on this usage of 'who' and 'which':—

'The first [casket], of gold, *who* this inscription bears,
. . . . . .
The second, silver, *which* this promise carries'.
Merchant of Venice.

'*The* which' is a very noticeable form in Elizabethan authors. It occurs in the authorised version of the Bible, and is not unfrequent in Shakespeare. Dr. Abbott mentions the French 'lequel' for comparison.

Dr. Morris quotes from Bp. Morton: 'The civil power, which is the very fountain and head from *the which* both these estates (Church and Commonwealth) do flow, and by *the which* it is brought to pass that there is a Church in any place'.

This form is never used in modern literature, except in imitations for special purposes. Byron and others afford occasional examples.

Thackeray is anything but serious in the following passage: 'I have seen many great folks in the course of my travels and time: . . . *the whom* whenever one looks at, one has a mild shock of awe and tremor'.—*Dr. Birch.* 'The' is never used with 'who', as it is here—humorously.

Adverbial substitutes for the ordinary relatives (with prepositions) were at one time very extensively used. The most common of them have already been exemplified in their advantageous employment. If moderately and judiciously used, they greatly tend to vary the monotony and lighten the heaviness of our relative construction. But they are readily enough abused; and some of our older writers may be looked at for warnings against using them too copiously. Full illustration would demand extracts of too great length; we will quote one or two short passages as examples.

'*Wherefore* to return to our former intent of discovering the natural way *whereby* rules have been found out concerning that goodness *wherewith* the Will of man ought to be moved in human actions; as everything naturally and necessarily doth desire the utmost good and greatest perfection *whereof* Nature hath made it capable, even so man'.—Hooker.

'Men laugh at the infirmities of others, by comparison *wherewith* [not a favourite now] their own abilities are set off and illustrated. Also, men laugh at jests, the wit *whereof* always consisteth in——'.—Hobbes.

'What fruit had ye then in those things *whereof* ye are now ashamed?' Here we may substitute 'that ——of', with advantage: not so easy in the following:—'I have therefore *whereof* I may glory through Jesus Christ'. We should need to say—'I have therefore *what* I may glory *in*'.

THE ADJECTIVE.

In the Introduction, I discussed the Definition of the Adjective. That definition has the merit, as I believe, of being precise. But it leaves a great deal for us to explain and reconcile.

I will first advert to what may be called the ordinary or typical Adjective; exemplified by such words as—large, quick, heavy, bright, blue, hard, sweet, hot, agreeable, old, important, difficult.

Every one of these words complies strictly with the definition. Used with a class noun they severally limit the extent of the class and add to its signification: a large stone, a quick pulse, heavy weights, a bright sky, blue beads, hard wood, sweet oranges, hot water, agreeable occupations. It matters not whether the noun is in the singular or in the plural.

And farther, such words may be compared for degree, in the manner of the Adjective: large, larger, largest. They are not inflected in the manner of any other part of speech; they have not plurals, like the Noun, nor tenses, like the Verb.

This Inflection test is often valuable when we are in doubt as to the Part of Speech that a word belongs to. It is especially required to decide between Nouns, Adjectives, and Verbs.

Yet farther. These words all express simple and single properties or facts, such as may be superadded to, or withheld from, the meanings of common nouns. The adjective 'large' expresses one single circumstance; and that circumstance may be present in, or wanting from, classes of things. We may have 'stones' mentioned without respect of size; we may impose the condition 'large' or 'small', and thereby constitute new and selected classes distinguished by largeness or smallness.

Finally. All the typical adjectives are intelligible by themselves; they do not need any words inserted, any filling up of the connection, or any extra or peculiar knowledge on

our part. If we know the vocabulary of the language, we at once understand 'old' as applied to a man, a tree, or a building.

These three peculiarities (over and above compliance with the definition)—namely, comparison, singleness of meaning, and being intelligible in themselves—while belonging to the great body of adjectives, are not uniformly found in words that are called adjectives, still less are they found in words that are used instead of adjectives.

THE ADJECTIVE CLAUSE.

The strict function of an Adjective, as expressed by the definition, is also performed by a Clause. Wishing to limit the large class 'men'—that is, to construct a smaller, select class—we may say, 'the men *that rise to eminence*', 'the men *that seek after riches*'. These clauses are restrictive or defining relative clauses; and their proper relative is 'that'.

Any adjective may be expanded into a clause: an *old* tree, a tree *that is old*; a *perfect* man, a man *that has become perfect*. This expansion does not make the adjective more intelligible; as regards meaning, therefore, it is superfluous. On some occasions it may be employed for emphasis. Eliphaz, in the book of Job, says—'He *that is wise* may be profitable unto himself'. The meaning is the same as 'a *wise* person', but the detaching of 'wise' by the clause makes it more emphatic. Instead of—'A perfectly *clear* water will show objects at a depth of fifty feet', we might say with a little more effect—'A water *that is* perfectly *clear*'. So—'A man *that is rich* can bear injustice'.

The utility of the Clause becomes apparent, when the limitation or specification of the class cannot be given by a simple adjective, but needs a statement of circumstance at some length: 'The houses *that you see on the right*'; 'the lands *that were once at the bottom of the sea*'; 'the people *that God chose for himself*'; 'the men that long experience has sobered'; 'hands that the rod of empire might have swayed';

'the flag that braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze'; 'the diseases that are most fatal in this country'.

Such constructions are innumerable. They are a legitimate employment of the restrictive relative clause. The circumstances are so various and so complicated that we could not express them by simple adjectives.

Adjective Clauses abbreviated.

We can often retain the full meaning of these adjective clauses, while changing the finite verb into the participle, and omitting the relative. This is a recognised means of obtaining conciseness, without loss of intelligibility: 'The houses *seen on your right*'; 'the people *chosen by God for himself*'; 'the men *sobered by long experience*'. Without the use of a participle we may have the same effect; we may have adjectives combined with qualifying phrases: 'hands *able to have swayed the rod of empire*'; 'the diseases *most fatal in this country*'. There are clauses that resist all such means of abbreviation: 'the flag *that braved* ———' is one.

We can often condense the adjective clause into a prepositional phrase, without loss of meaning: 'The man *that wants food*', 'the man *wanting food*', 'the man *in want of food*'. 'The house *that is situated in the wood*', 'the house *situated in the wood*', 'the house *in the wood*'. 'The road that goes to the right', 'the road leading to the right', 'the road *to the right*'. 'The members that represent London—representing London—*for London*'.

Up to this point, we have retained all the words essential to the full expression of the meaning. Abbreviation, however, does not stop here; important words are often left out, in the belief that they can be guessed by the hearer. 'The books *that are published for amusing the young at Christmas*', might become 'books *published for amusement at Christmas*', an expression still containing the main circumstances. When, however, it is yet further shortened to '*Christmas* books', we have to guess or divine the meaning. We reflect upon the connection there is between Christmas

and books, and conclude that the books referred to are the amusing books presented to the young at Christmas. This is to apply our knowledge of the various usages of Christmas, to discover what is intended by the two words 'Christmas books'; and but for such knowledge the combination could not be understood.

This remark paves the way for considering—

THE NOUN AS ADJECTIVE.

The employing of one Noun to limit or qualify another, in the manner of an Adjective, is not a rare and random exception; it is a frequent and admitted process of the language. If it happened only now and then, we might treat it as merely a slight irregularity; but we find it practised upon system, and on the large scale. We are therefore bound to explain it according to some principle.

As the adjective is defined to be a word that limits the extent and augments the meaning of a class, general, or common noun, every word so employed should in strictness be reckoned an adjective. Yet when we meet with such expressions as '*diamond* ring', '*horse* guards', '*prize* ox', '*Sunday* clothes', we treat the words—diamond, horse, prize, Sunday'—as Nouns. We apply to them the Inflection test, and find that they are not compared like adjectives, but declined as nouns.

Of the four peculiarities attaching to the ordinary adjective, these words usually possess only one—that expressed in the definition. They do not compare; they seldom express simple properties or facts that may be added to, or withheld from, a class of things; they are not intelligible by themselves.

Contrast '*diamond* ring' with '*bright* ring', '*old* ring', '*precious* ring'. 'Diamond' cannot be compared. It may indeed express a fact that may be superadded to a ring—which is the second of the specifying circumstances. But as regards the last point, it does not explain itself; we must

supply from our independent knowledge, the fact that some rings are *mounted with diamonds.*

Contrast again '*Sunday* clothes' with '*new* clothes', '*cheap* clothes', '*gay* clothes' 'Sunday' does not express a simple fact that can be present in or absent from clothes; it expresses a special day in the week characterised by numerous peculiarities and institutions. It cannot properly be joined with other nouns; the meanings of this noun and an ordinary class noun would refuse to blend; we could not embody the ideas—Sunday and tree, Sunday and star, Sunday and man. Finally, the combination 'Sunday clothes' does not explain itself; not only must we know what is the characteristic meaning of Sunday—the day of rest and of religious ordinances—but we must know minutely the habits and usages connected with it, such as that people put on their newest clothes. Bringing this minute information to bear, we discover that what is intended by 'Sunday clothes' 'is clothes *that are worn on Sunday*'; and to express this fully to a person that knows only the more general features of Sunday, we need to expand the words into a clause, such as shall convey the omitted circumstance. It thus appears that the combinations made up of a noun qualified by another noun are *abbreviated* clauses, the abbreviation being carried so far as to drop words essential to the meaning. To show that a noun used as an Adjective does not explain itself in the way that the ordinary adjective does, take these four combinations—'diamond ring', 'diamond dust', 'diamond fields', 'diamond form'. The same word is present in all, but the meanings are totally different; the understanding of one is not a clue to the understanding of the others; 'diamond ring,' a ring *mounted with diamonds;* 'diamond dust', dust *from powdered diamonds;* 'diamond fields', fields *containing diamonds;* 'diamond form' or crystallization, the crystalline form *taken on by diamonds.* Other examples:—Christmas books, Christmas gifts, Christmas shows, Christmas holidays, Christmas eve, Christmas carols; horse play, horse hirer, horse guards, horse flesh, horse power, horse hair, horse

harness, horse rugs, horse van, horse market; land forces, land birds, land laws, land surveyor; eye service, eye infirmary, eye doctor, eye tooth, eye glass, bird's eye view; man-trap, man hater, the man mountain (Gulliver), man servant; prize ox, prize money, prize taker, prize poem, prize cup; honey moon, honey bee, honey comb, honey suckle; cattle truck, cattle driver, cattle plague, cattle show; Waterloo veterans, Waterloo medal, Waterloo victory, Waterloo station; sea fight, sea voyage, sea sickness, sea salt, sea trout, sea serpent, sea urchins.

'The powers of the world *to come*' is an abbreviation of 'the world that is to come'. The infinitive 'to come' is equal to the adjectives 'future', 'coming', but even as an infinitive we call it a noun (for a shortened clause) qualifying 'world'. Such infinitive constructions are plentiful; so are the gerund forms—'a horse to sell' 'a prize to be competed for'.

The phrase, in Natural Philosophy, '*foot-pound*' needs a long explanation to supply the circumstances that connect 'foot' and 'pound'. Again, we may know the signification of 'stump' and of 'orator', without knowing what is meant by 'stump orator'. This is supplied by expanding the words into a long clause.

The extensive practice, therefore, of employing nouns for adjectives is to be referred to the ellipsis or omission of particulars known to the persons that we address. When we use the words 'prize ox', instead of the clause 'an ox that gained a prize at a cattle show', we do so because our hearers have reason to know that this is meant. The words could equally mean 'an ox given as a prize to be contended for', as in the games described in the twenty-third book of the Iliad. No such uncertainties occur in the employment of ordinary adjectives, such as 'large', 'brown', 'heavy', 'young'.

We have become so habituated to these short expressions, that we are scarcely conscious that they are the last remnants of explanatory clauses. Many of them may never have been expressed in full as clauses; and, therefore, they are not, in point of fact, abbreviations. Yet they are so

in substance; when the hearer, understanding the words separately, yet fails to understand the combination, the only resource is to supply the connecting words, amounting usually to an explanatory clause or sentence.

The habit of using abbreviating nouns is very general in headings, designations, titles: as—Reform Act, Police Regulations, home amusements, field sports, Yorkshire bacon, railway director, stage manager, bank agent, Davy lamp, town clerk, errand boy, message girl, summer lodgings, turnip seeds, Archangel tar, opera house, upholstery furnishings, window curtains, hearth rugs.

In specifying the material that things are made of, the noun of material is prefixed: a gold brooch, silver money, iron girders, brass nails, earth works, marble statues, Dolomite mountains, hair—wool—straw mattresses, silk curtains, muslin dress, lace collars. There was an incipient attempt to coin adjectives out of these words, by the suffix 'en'; a few such remain in the language, as golden, silvern, leaden, brazen, wooden, silken, woollen, flaxen, waxen, earthen. The only advantage of this form would have been to discriminate the use of the noun as denoting the material that a thing was made of from other meanings, as seen in 'gold diggers', 'silk worm'.

The classical languages did not allow the use of the noun for the adjective; every word qualifying a noun substantive took the adjective form, and was declined as an adjective. To express the material of a thing, either a clause must be used, or the noun of material must have an adjective form; as, in Latin, *aureus*, *ferreus*, *marmoreus*. The facility of our language, in this particular, although partaking of the nature of licence or irregularity, gives great scope for condensation without failing to be understood.*

* Compare also German, where the two or more nouns form a compound word of any length; as ours sometimes do (with the use of a hyphen):—

Wassermühle (water-mill), Holzauction (wood sale, sale of wood), Theaterbesucher (theatre visitors, persons that go to the theatre), Marktberichte (market reports, reports on the state of the markets), Handdreschmaschine (hand thrashing-machine), Mineralwassermaschine (mineral-water machine), Sommertanzsaal (summer dancing-saloon).

ANOMALOUS OR ARTIFICIAL ADJECTIVES.

At the outset was exemplified the ordinary, regular, or standard Adjective. The explanation now given of the wide employment of nouns for adjectives, and especially the remark in the last paragraph, may serve to prepare us for the consideration of an artificial class of adjectives, also extensively used.

To bring these into view, let us study the following titles of four government offices :—

Home Office,
Foreign Office,
Colonial Office,
India Office.

In the first and fourth—'Home', 'India'—nouns are used for adjectives, and are the last remnants of explanatory clauses. In the second and third—'Foreign', 'Colonial'—we have adjectives; consequently, in them there is the seeming of a regular adjective construction. The seeming is a mere delusion. These words are adjectives in form—they are not nouns—yet they are not employed in their proper signification as adjectives. If we enquire into the usual meaning of 'foreign', we find it denotes something belonging to, or obtained from, other countries—foreign wines, foreign sugar, foreign languages, a foreign army; being opposed to what is of native growth. But 'foreign office' does not mean an office 'situated abroad'. The real meaning cannot be assigned without the same process of filling up that is needed for 'Home Office' and 'India Office'; we must supply—'office *for transacting affairs with other countries*'; 'foreign affairs office' would be more suggestive of the meaning intended. The same line of criticism applies to 'Colonial Office'. There is an adjective form, but not the adjective meaning: 'Colonial' is applied to the produce of our colonies; 'Colonial Office', is the office *wherein the government of the colonies is carried on.* We might just as well say '*Colonies* office'; nothing is gained by the adjective form—colonial. So far from gain there is loss and

confusion, for the adjective has been already appropriated to a different signification, whereas there is nothing misleading in the noun; there is simply an enigma to be solved, namely, what is the link of connection between 'colonies' and 'office'. The four descriptions would be all on an equal footing, and on the only consistent footing, if given thus —Home Office, Foreign States Office, Colonies Office, India Office.

To take another example. The expressions 'Crimean war, Russian war, Affghan war, Ashantee war'—represent a common noun limited to an individual case by another word; in two instances an adjective, 'Crimean', 'Russian', in the two others a noun, 'Affghan', 'Ashantee'. Yet the character of the combination is the same in all; it is an abbreviation for 'a war that was carried on in a particular country, or against a particular people'; everything is omitted except the name of the country or the people, because a reader presumes, seeing the word 'war' united with the name of a country, that that country is a party in the war. The adjective forms in 'Crimean' and 'Russian' do not alter the nature of the combination; these are not real adjectives, they are nouns in disguise. The other forms, 'Affghan' and 'Ashantee war', are the more straightforward expressions, and the adjective suffix in 'Crimean' and 'Russian' probably would not have been added but for ease of pronunciation. For the reason above given, the consistency of the language would have been better preserved by 'Crimea war' and 'Russia war' (we say 'Russia leather', 'Turkey carpets', 'Paris' as well as 'Parisian' fashions). There was a war of the Spanish Succession, which might have been designated 'Spanish Succession war', or 'Succession war'; and nothing would have been gained by an adjective termination—'Succession*al* War'.

We have 'rural sports', 'floral exhibitions', 'ancestral halls', 'parental, filial, marital relations', 'verbal memory', 'ceremonial law', 'septennial celebration', 'celestial mechanics', 'legal procedure', 'parochial relief,' 'royal in-

firmary', 'lunar distance':—in all which there is the form of the adjective with the force of the noun; all are abbreviated, and, to be understood, need filling up. In most, if not in all, the noun form would serve the purpose better, by showing the true state of the case: country sports, flower exhibitions, ancestor halls, parent relation, word memory, ceremony law, seven years celebration, heavens mechanics, law procedure, parish relief.

The adjective ending 'an' is employed for the same delusive purpose: Newtonian telescope, Darwinian hypothesis, Athenian politics, Persian repulse, Shakespearian criticism, Spenserian stanza. The selection of such forms is quite capricious; we might equally well say—'Davian lamp', 'Bamptonian lecture'; the reason is that they mean nothing grammatically, and are guided either by the ear, or by accident. Between the empty pomp of the adjective and the nakedness of the noun, we have two intermediate forms, more used than either of those—the possessive, and the phrase with 'of': 'Britain's attitude', 'the republic of France'. The grammar of these modes of qualifying nouns will be afterwards discussed.

It is obvious that the combination 'lacustrine dwellings' is nothing better than 'lake dwellings'. We should not make 'stump orator' more intelligible by the rendering 'stumpian or stumpistic orator'.

These made-up adjectives are liable to the ambiguities of the noun form, as already exemplified; which shows that they depend, as much as the nouns, on our guessing the intermediate connecting operation. 'Legal act, legal action, legal style', are all different; 'religious conduct, religious truth, religious faith', might as well have been 'religion conduct, religion truth, religion faith'; the operation of filling up the several connecting links that make the separate meanings is equally necessary in both modes. 'Fabulous ages', meaning 'ages whose history is fable', would be less misleading if written 'fable ages', 'legend periods': 'fabulous' properly qualifies a 'narrative' or 'story'. 'A dying man' suggests but one meaning: 'dying love' would

mean 'love that is fading or dying out'; it is used in a sense that would be more suitably given by 'death love'. 'Long measures', for 'measures of length', should be 'length measures'. A 'German teacher' ought to mean a 'teacher that is a German'; in the sense of 'teacher of the German language', it should be properly 'German language teacher'. We submit to the shorter form, in spite of the ambiguity; nevertheless, the example is in point as showing the variety of the Adjective form in elliptical combinations. ''Tis our *opening day*' cannot be construed as a noun qualified by an adjective, unless we are prepared to defy the meaning. The filling up is essential to the parsing ''tis the day *that we open* or *commence upon*': shortened—'our day for opening'. '*Intending* purchasers, communicants'—are persons *intending to* purchase or *to* communicate. '*Expectant* minister' is one *that expects to become* a minister.

'Our Father who is in heaven' is contracted without loss of meaning to 'Our Father *in heaven*'; the phrase fully represents the precise connection between 'Our Father' and 'heaven'. But the farther transformation of the phrase into the adjective 'heavenly' is misleading. This adjective is not employed in its best understood meaning in the combination 'heavenly Father'. The use of the noun 'heaven Father' would be less misleading; it would only involve a guess as to the purport of the two words taken in conjunction.

For the extreme illustration of the artificial adjective we might refer to the Latin language, which forbade in form the employment of nouns as adjectives. The practice, however, was allowed in substance. Nouns had to assume adjective terminations. To signify the power that could be exercised by a father of a family, *pater* was made into an adjective, and the expression was *patria potestas*, 'father power'. We say 'paternal power', gaining by the formal adjective nothing but pomposity. The combinations of noun and adjective, in Latin, are thus as enigmatical, as far from being self-explaining, as our combinations of noun

and noun. When Juvenal says of Marius, how much happier would it have been for himself and for Rome, had he died,

Quum de *Teutonico* vellet descendere *curru*,

the reader would suppose that, with other spoils taken in his Teutonic war, he had brought home a carriage, and used it in the triumphal procession. One needs special information to interpret 'Teutonicus currus' as the carriage (doubtless made in Rome) that he rode in during the triumph gained for vanquishing the Teutons.

When these adjectives of artificial formation have contracted by usage a *constant* or *uniform meaning*, they acquire the characters of the ordinary or typical adjective. The adjectives—English, German, Colonial—although in their origin they might have been anything, are now narrowed to the special signification of 'belonging to, or coming from, England, Germany, the Colonies'. It is impossible in the nature of things that a sense should have been found to 'English manufactures', if all that is meant by the word 'England' were to be fused with the meaning of manufactures. But by a termination restricting the signification to 'subsisting, or produced, in England', we may obtain a meaning that can be superadded to, or withdrawn from, particular things, as manufactures, houses, towns, &c.

On this principle, we account for the deriving of adjectives from nouns, by the suffixes 'less', 'ly', 'ful,' 'ish,' and some others. The meaning of 'home' cannot be superadded to 'man'; there cannot be an object that has every property that a man possesses, together with every property that a home possesses. But we may assert of a man that he is without a home, and this may be done shortly by a significant suffix, as 'less,' 'homeless'. So a man may have a peculiar style of manners or demeanour, such as belongs to people that spend their time principally in their homes, and see little of the world, or of general society; this fact is indicated by 'homelike', or 'homely', which by virtue of the constancy of the meaning, are correct or regular adjectives. 'Fruitful', 'careful', 'needful',

are adjectives of the same class; we do not need to go back upon their origin, except from curiosity. 'Fruitful field' explains itself, without an effort of guessing what is the intention of putting together the nouns 'fruit' and 'field'. We need not, therefore, raise the same questions about these, as we have to do when we encounter such words as 'legal', 'natural', 'Parliamentary', where we must divine in each case what is the sense of the writer.

THE PREPOSITIONAL ADJECTIVE PHRASE.

We have seen adjective clauses shortened to phrases, as well as to nouns. This is quite common. 'An honest man's the noblest work *of God*' is 'the noblest work *that God has made*'. 'A man *of sense*' is 'a man *that possesses sense*', a sense man, a sensible man. The full form is the restrictive or adjective clause; the curtailed or abridged form may be a phrase, or an adjective.

The phrase may be more significant or expressive than a noun standing alone; this is owing to the preposition, which has a meaning in itself, and limits the range of our guesses as to what is intended by connecting the two nouns. 'A man *in* London' is more suggestive and definite than 'a London man', although we should still need a complete clause to make us sure of the sense—'a man that lives in London', 'a man that is in London casually', or whatever else. 'A man from London, to London, with London, against London'—are all suggestive of the special modes of connexion between man and London; they intimate less than a clause, and more than the noun 'London' by itself.

The preposition that most frequently enters into the prepositional Adjective phrase, and at the same time suggests least, is 'of', called the preposition of reference. So vague is the relation indicated by 'of', as compared with other prepositions—to, from, by, with, &c.—that we might almost as well be without it. 'Work of God' hardly expresses anything more definite than 'God work'; 'the noblest *God* work' is as suggestive as 'the noblest work *of God*'. The

'of' is little else than a various mode of joining two nouns, leaving the sense to be divined as in the case of two nouns without any binding word. 'Man of valour' gives no more insight than 'valour man' would do; it is more euphonious, and that is all. So with 'principle of utility'; the meaning would be quite as clearly conveyed by 'utility principle'.

THE POSSESSIVE AS AN ADJECTIVE.

It is an extensive process of our language to qualify a noun by the possessive case of another noun. The possessive inflection being mostly confined to persons, the usage is confined to these; yet it is still very frequent '*The king's* conscience', '*the lion's* share', 'Cold is *Cadwallo's* tongue'.

The precise effect of the possessive form, and the latitude of meaning allowed to it, will be considered once for all under the Possessive (INFLECTION). What we may remark here is the analogy to a suffix for converting a noun into an adjective, and for imparting a special signification instead of leaving two nouns loose. 'King's conscience' and 'royal conscience' are perfect equivalents in grammar; the case-ending operates exactly like the suffix 'al' to define the bearing of the two words, 'king' and conscience'; while both modes are almost the same as the phrase made up by the vague preposition 'of', 'conscience of the king'.

THE PARTICIPLE AS AN ADJECTIVE.

The condensation of a clause yields first a participial phrase, that is, a participle with an object or an adverbial qualification. When the participle is bereft of these complements, belonging to it as a part of the verb, it assumes the character of an adjective: 'a *learned* man', 'a *beaten* foe'. These are parsed indifferently as participles, as adjectives, or as participial adjectives.

The participle may be regarded as having passed into an adjective when the meaning is no longer a single act, or display, but a permanent character or habit. 'A man *learned* in Philosophy' contains the word 'learned' as a true parti-

ciple. 'A *learned* man', signifying a general character for learning, shows 'learned' more as an adjective. 'A horse that refuses (refusing) to go', participle; 'a refusing horse', adjective. We employ such adjectives occasionally for a single act or result; 'he is a ruined man' means that 'he has just been ruined'.

THE ADJECTIVE IN CO-ORDINATION.

There are constructions, not unfrequently occurring, where the adjective cannot be construed as restricting the noun. An adjective is often applied to an individual, as 'mighty Cæsar', 'vast ocean', 'mortal man', 'pretty Jane', 'merry old England'; in such instances, there cannot be any farther restriction.

To account for these cases, we must remark that, from the nature of a proposition, an adjective in the predicate does not limit or restrict, but *adds to*, the meaning of the subject. 'Cæsar was great, ambitious, unfortunate', contains three predicate adjectives, whose meaning is superinduced upon the meaning of Cæsar. 'Great men are rare': 'men' are restricted by 'great'; 'rare' does not restrict them farther, it adds to what we already know of great men the fact that they are rare.

We can reconcile this usage to the restrictive function of the adjective, by supplying an omitted noun: thus, 'great men are rare *individuals*'; where 'rare' has a truly restrictive force and limits objects. 'Cæsar was a great, ambitious, and unfortunate *man*'.

When a co-ordinating relative clause is abridged or reduced to its predicate adjective, we have a co-ordinating adjective. Thus—'He underwent a reproof, *which was merited*' might be 'he underwent a *merited* reproof'. The adjective is then the equivalent of the co-ordinating clause, and does not limit 'reproof'. 'His *wise* counsels were rejected'; this does not mean that those of his counsels that were wise were rejected, but that 'his counsels' altogether were rejected, and that these counsels were wise.

'The author gives an account of the mode of compressing steel by hydraulic pressure, *which is interesting*'. Rather than have a loose co-ordinating clause at the end of the sentence, we might say 'gives an *interesting* account'. There would be no ambiguity: we should not limit 'account' by the adjective, we should be aware that it has a co-ordinating application.

This is one of Gibbon's habitual contractions; as when he speaks of 'this *sequestered* region' or 'the *splendid* colouring of fancy and fiction'.

'Berkeley saw that there was no sincerity in this *partial* or *unstable* compromise'. Both adjectives are co-ordinating.

An example is given by Mr. Washington Moon, of a lady that, upon being addressed by her husband, 'My dearest Maria', replied—'Am I to understand that you have other Marias?' Her ground obviously was the restrictive function of the adjective; and she could not be met except by vindicating the usage for co-ordination, which is especially frequent with singular names.

'I wield the flail of the *lashing* hail,
And whiten the *green* plains under.'

'The crest of *purple* Apennine.'

'The *castled* crag of Drachenfels
Frowns o'er the *wide* and *winding* Rhine.'

LIMITATION TO AN INDIVIDUAL.

The ordinary effect of an adjective is to convert a common noun into the name of a narrower or select class—'horses', 'black horses'; 'king', 'wise king'. By successive narrowings, we may come at last to an individual. 'Jewish wise kings' would yield a very small class, while an additional epithet, as 'renowned', or 'proverbial', or 'dissolute', would suffice to signify an individual.

Another mode of narrowing a class to an individual is by a superlative degree, 'wisest king'; 'heaviest metal'.

47965

There can be only one wisest king, and only one heaviest metal.

More usual than either of these modes is the employment of the Pronominal Possessives and Demonstratives (especially the Definite Article).

A Common Noun may be restricted to a narrower class by providing a distinct noun instead of using an adjective. In the great class expressed by the common noun 'building', we have smaller classes designated by special names—'church', 'fortress', 'castle', 'mansion', 'cottage'. Adjectives might have been used, and are occasionally used; 'ecclesiastical building' is much the same as 'church'.

In Natural History, the naming of subordinate or inferior classes is conducted on both methods.

ADVERBS AS ADJECTIVES.

In the inscription on Napier's monument, it is said 'the most *numerous* subscribers were common soldiers'. If we regard 'subscribers' as a common noun limited by 'numerous', we shall find some trouble in explaining the limitation. We may have 'rich subscribers', and 'poor', 'willing' and 'unwilling', and each individual subscriber may be in one or other of these classes; but a subscriber cannot well be a numerous subscriber. The word 'numerous' is not in its grammatical place, when made an adjective to limit 'subscribers'. The sentence might set forth that 'of the subscribers, common soldiers made up the largest number' or 'the majority'. In that case, 'number' appears as a noun qualified by a superlative; and the construction is not in any respect anomalous.

Again, 'the robin is our *frequent* visitor'. We may divide visitors into those that come seldom, and those that come often, and, so far, 'rare' and 'frequent' may be said to have the function of adjectives. But the more natural grammatical expression is—'The robin visits us *frequently*, or *rarely*'; the adjective being a transformed adverb, to go

along with a noun that is a transformed verb. This will be fully treated of under the Verb.

ADJECTIVES CLASSIFIED.

It is usual to classify Adjectives into those of Quality, those of Quantity, and those originating in the Pronouns.

The great body of Adjectives come under Quality. Not only so, but the definition is best fitted to these.

Adjectives of QUANTITY are most characteristically represented by the numerals—one, two, three, &c. These are applied to common nouns, and limit them, imparting a new meaning to the noun; and, in so far, comply with the definition. Yet there is a considerable difference between '*just* men' and '*four* men'; not enough to prevent their being classed under the Adjectives, but enough to distinguish them as kinds of Adjectives. Grammatically, different usages separate the two kinds, which is the main reason for distinguishing them in Grammar. For example, comparison is inapplicable to the numerals; we compare 'just', but not 'four'.

A modification of the numerals, 'one, two, three, &c.', gives the ordinal adjectives—'first, second, third, &c.'; these also limit nouns, and with the effect of narrowing them to an individual; they are among the means of obtaining a singular name by the union of general words—'first prize', 'second house', 'ninth regiment'. They cannot be compared.

These adjectives are distinguished by their definiteness or precision; they are the strictest mode of assigning degree, and are used in all exact measurements. There are a few other words that number, but not with the same precision: many, some, any, all, most. The only one of these that is definite is 'all', but it is not the definiteness of number. As to the rest, we may make very various estimates; 'many stars' may mean a hundred or a thousand. Still the fact expressed is number; and if the strict numerals be adjectives, so are these.

If 'all' strictly meant number, viz., the entire number of a multitude—'all men', 'all animals', 'all cities', 'all stars'—it could not be applied except to a common noun in the plural. The phrase 'all England' would then be improper. The use of such a phrase shows that we may use the adjective in place of 'whole' as opposed to parts, or divisions of a thing. It may be assumed that the primary and literal meaning is numerical; in the case of anything divided into parts, we express the totality by 'all the parts', 'all parts of England', and then curtail the expression to 'all England'.

The Distributives—each, either, other, neither, several, every—have an equal title to be called Adjectives. They limit nouns, and add a new signification; but they cannot be compared, and are grammatically distinct from the Adjectives of Quality.

So far there is no ground for refusing these words the rank of Adjectives, while there are grounds for making them a special class of Adjectives. Mr. Earle, indeed, calls the Numerals a *noun-group*, capable of assuming the threefold character of substantive, adjective, and adverb. But when the question is asked, Which is their leading function?—we must answer that they are not Nouns, but Adjectives. 'Two and two is four', 'come by threes', are not primary but derived expressions; they start from the adjective form, and resemble abstract nouns obtained from adjectives, or else collective nouns. We cannot suppose the primitive and prevailing form of the numeral to be an abstract or a collective noun, and that the adjectives are derived from these. The word 'dozen' did not precede the numeral 'twelve'.

The construction of the numerals, definite and indefinite, is with a common noun in the plural: *two* men, *most* men, *some* men, *many* men, *any* men. 'Many' is also used with a singular, '*many a man*'; this is by a special license, for the emphasis of singularity—like '*every man*' for 'all men'. So 'any man' is used to point out individuals, the same as *any one man*. 'Some' has likewise an individual application, 'some man will come forward', 'some case will arise'.

The numerals, for the purposes of calculation, are represented by the ciphers, 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. These are also sometimes used in ordinary composition: 'He bought 10 oxen at £30 each;' 'The temperature of the air is 55° F.' This method should not be employed, except in business, or in science, or with such numbers as cannot be written in short compass. A distinction may be drawn between numbers accurately ascertained and numbers vaguely ascertained: 'there are 365 days in the year' (precise); 'there were more than a thousand persons present' (vague). For cases like the last, figures are unsuitable, it being the effect of these to suggest a precisely ascertained number.

'The motion was carried by a majority of 102, or *three* to *one*'. The first number is precise, the others are approximate.

The following contains a farther impropriety: 'Wanted 3 or 4 *dozen* females to make match boxes'. The collective words 'couple', 'dozen', are suitable only when the individuals are put to use in couples, or in dozens. Say rather—'Wanted from forty to fifty females', if the employer is unable to assign an exact number.

Adjectives of Quantity in *mass* or *bulk* are a very different class from any of the foregoing: they are—great, large, small, much, little, vast, enormous, &c. They do not break up the subject into parts, for numerical expression, but regard it as continuous, and proceed by uncertain gradations or leaps. 'A *large* town', 'a *high* mountain', 'a *long* time', are nouns limited by adjectives of vague, continuous quantity.

In one view, these are to all intents adjectives of quality: 'large towns' selects from 'towns' a limited class, designated as 'large'; the rest being not large—middling or small. There is no grammatical peculiarity requiring these be singled out, or kept apart from the Adjectives of Quality.

There is another way of using them to make up the quantity, degree, or amount of any thing; '*much* wind', '*small* weight', '*abundant* fruit', '*extensive* grounds', '*great* admiration'. This is a rough way of expressing the

measured amount of the objects named; the accurate way being by exact numeration, or numerals. For 'extensive grounds' we might have 'grounds occupying a hundred acres', or other numerical estimate.

Such adjectives should not be called adjectives of quality; they are adjectives of quantity, yet not numerals, definite or indefinite. They express *unnumbered* quantity. The ends of grammar are best served by placing them in a distinct class.

It is usual to reckon among Adjectives of Quantity, the words *no, none.* Excepting that they are used with nouns, they do not possess the characters common to adjectives. They do not limit the class noun by setting up a smaller select class; they, in fact, abolish the subject altogether; 'no house' is the negative or exclusion of all houses.

By Dr. Latham, 'no' is regarded as an Article; but it is in its nature equally repugnant to the nature of an article.

I prefer to regard it as the Negative Adverb, made to assume the form of an Adjective for a particular convenience. The etymology is traced thus: *ne* + *ân* = not + one; coalescing in Old English into 'nân', 'non' — 'none'; which last is cut down to 'no'. Compare 'an' and 'a'; the 'n' being dropped before a consonant. (See Morris, 'Accidence of English Language', p. 145, § 229.)

There is a kind of negation or denial that the negative adverb does not meet, namely, *universal* denial; as may be shown thus. For a singular subject—'John', 'the moon'—denial is easy and sure: 'John is *not* here', 'the moon is *not* visible'. But when the subject is universal, the denial by this form is ineffective: 'all the men are not here' is not a universal denial; it allows that some men may be here, it merely declares that some at least are wanting. In short, it is only a partial denial. If we mean to negative the presence of all the men, to deny that any man is present, we need some other construction. We may attain the end by finding a word that is the negative of the predicate—'all the men are *absent*'; 'all the heavenly bodies are *invisible*'. The more usual way is to prefix 'no' to the subject, thus:

'*No* men are present'; '*no* heavenly bodies are visible'. The negative by thus preceding the noun, comes into the position of the adjective, but we may still regard it as playing the part of an adverb.

This is the type of universal denial, and it is the most emphatic form of negation to be found in the language. Like all our strong effects, it is apt to be abused by being overdone. 'He has *no* home' is a superfluous variety of 'he has *not* a home', which puts the negative word to its proper function.

Our plural noun, without 'all', has assumed the meaning of universality; hence we obtain a universal denial by the adverb in its proper place and character. 'The men are *not* present', 'the stars are not visible', 'metals do not occur in the newer rocks'. This is the mild form of universal denial; and, for ordinary purposes, it is quite sufficient. The other form should be reserved for occasions where there is need to deny with energy. 'Men have *never* seen God' is substantially a universal denial. The strong form is '*No man* hath seen God at any time'. Equally emphatic, without any license, would have been, '*Never* has any man seen God'. The energy consists in placing the negative word first in the clause.

'*No* mere man, since the fall, is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God': 'Since the fall, mere men are *un*able in this life—'.

'*No* golf balls coming over these walls will be returned'. 'Golf balls———will *not* be returned'.

'*No* dogs admitted' would be more tolerable in a form common enough—'*no admittance* to dogs'. It would be sufficient, and therefore preferable, to say—'Dogs (are) *not* admitted'.

'We shall get *no* farther relaxation of the rules'; 'The rules will *not* be farther relaxed for us'.

'*No* degree of knowledge attainable by man is able to set him above the want of hourly assistance: and therefore *no* man should think it unnecessary to learn those arts by which friendship may be gained'. 'Any degree of knowledge

attainable by man is *un*able to set him above the need of hourly assistance; hence every one should think it *not* unnecessary——'.

No knight in England could match king Henry VIII. in the tournament'. 'In the tournament Henry was *not* matched (un-matched) by any knight in England'.

'I have *none* in my possession': 'I do *not* possess one'.

The PRONOUN ADJECTIVES are a well-marked sub-division; they are distinguished from the rest grammatically. The mere circumstance of originating in the Pronouns might not be enough of itself to constitute a distinction; words variously originating may have the same use. But like the Pronouns themselves, these words are few in number, and of incessant recurrence; so that the grammarian is justified in explaining what is the meaning of each as an individual.

Of these Pronominal or Pronoun Adjectives, the most important are the Demonstratives 'this', 'that'. These are, properly speaking, Adjectives; they are used with Nouns as limiting words. They differ from Adjectives of quality in the manner of the limitation. An adjective of quality—'old men'—makes a new and select class with a new character 'old', which is for the most part a fixed or permanent feature of the narrow or select class. The demonstrative 'that' limits a common noun, by selecting an individual or individuals in a particular situation for the time being—'*that* man', the man now in our presence, or the man just mentioned.

For the important function of referring distinctively to two subjects (or more) already mentioned, we have a series of adjective couples, including the two demonstratives. They are—

That—This,
The one—The other,
The former—The latter,
The first—The second,
The first named—The last named or mentioned.

By writers generally, the couple 'former and latter' is

more used than any of the rest. In my judgment, the other forms are in many instances preferable. From an extensive examination of cases, I am inclined to believe that the reference by 'former and latter' is frequently very obscure. I subjoin a few examples, selecting first from Gibbon, who makes great use of the construction.

'We have computed the *inhabitants*, and contemplated the *public works* of the Roman Empire. The observation of the number and greatness of its cities will serve to confirm the *former* and multiply the *latter*'. A most perplexed reference. The antecedent to 'former' should have been '(we have given) *a computation of the inhabitants*'; while 'multiply the *latter*' refers simply to *public works*. There is, moreover, the very common fault of such references—too great a distance from the subjects. Nothing short of repeating the subjects themselves, or giving a various wording of them, would enable a reader easily to follow the passage. The second sentence might run thus—'A consideration of the number and the greatness of the cities belonging to the Empire, will confirm our statement of the population, and enhance our estimate of the public works'.

'The productions of happier climates and the industry of civilised nations were introduced into the west; and the natives were encouraged to multiply the *former* and improve the *latter*.' In this case, 'the one and the other', a more homely English form, or 'the first and the second', would answer equally well. But the double reference itself is of questionable propriety in such cases. It is very artificial and clumsy, if not slovenly. We are introduced to two subjects, but are not warned to keep in mind the precise order that they are given in; presently, we come upon words that direct us to recall first one and then the other, in the exact order; the hardship being aggravated by the absence of any marked natural sequence. Further the suggestion of the idea of *contrast* is not inconsiderable; a contrast, however, that turns out, on examination, to be merely a contrast of position, or one of statement. Nor, in this special case, is it necessary for the historian's purpose to indicate in the second

clause anything beyond the fact that the nations were stimulated to still greater improvements; the attempt to keep apart the raw produce, and the industry, is merely a useless burden.

'In this single instance, the successors of Cæsar and Augustus were persuaded to follow the example of the *former* rather than the precept of the *latter*'. Similar objections apply here. The reader is presented with two subjects, but he is not told to keep the order firmly in his mind, so as to recover each in its turn by that cue. 'Succeeding emperors were persuaded to follow the example of Cæsar rather than the precept of Augustus.'

This couple is still more awkward when the subjects are in different grammatical places. 'The figure Apostrophe closely resembles passive Personification. The only difference is that in the *former* the writer addresses the dead or absent; whereas in the *latter* an address is made to an abstraction or to some inanimate object.' A clear case for repeating the names.

'No vegetables should be stored in the same room with peas, for the *latter* are sure to acquire the flavour of the *former*.' Repetition would be preferable here. It is to be remarked, as a general principle of style, that the refinement of not repeating leading terms is meant for polished and artistic composition, and is not called for either in science or in business, in both of which precision is the prime requisite. 'Vegetables should not be stored with peas; the vegetables will flavour the peas'. There is nothing against taste in the repetition. By a more elegant condensation, we might say—'Peas will contract the flavour of vegetables stored in the same room'.

The following is from De Quincey. 'The rebels had already been permitted to possess themselves of the county of Wexford in its whole northern division, Ross and Duncannon only excepted; of which *the latter* was not liable to be captured by *coup de main*, and *the other* was saved by the procrastination of the rebels.' Here, too, we are not warned on the mention of Ross and Duncannon, that we must re-

member them in their order, and at once recall Duncannon on the spur of the word 'latter'. 'The other', meaning the one left, here refers to the first: it takes the place of 'the former'.

Compare with these instances Macaulay's practice. 'James had, during the last year of his reign, been even more hated by the Tories than by the Whigs; for to the *Whigs* he was only an enemy, and to the *Tories* he had been a faithless and thankless friend.'

Our translation of the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican is an interesting example of our mode of reference for a twofold subject. 'Two men went up into the temple to pray, *the one* a Pharisee and *the other* a Publican. The *Pharisee* stood and prayed thus ———. And the *Publican*, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven. . . . I tell you *this man* went down to his house justified rather than *the other*'. First the subjects are introduced by their special designations, along with the correlatives 'the one' and 'the other', which serve to indicate a contrast, and to warn the reader that they are to be kept distinctly separate. On the first recurrence of the subjects, the names are repeated; on the second occasion, 'this' is used for the second of the two, being the nearest; 'the other' is used for the first. The same use of 'the other' occurred in the sentence from De Quincey; and both show that 'the other' may apply to the first in order, if the second has been already singled out. The following old paraphrase of the passage now quoted shows the more usual practice in making 'the one' and 'the other' stand for 'the first and the second', or 'the former and the latter'.

'Did two go up to the temple to pray?
Oh rather say *the one* went up to brag, *the other* to pray,
The one the nearer to the altar trod,
The other nearer to the altar's God.'

In easy cases, I should prefer this form. Next to it, in my judgment, is 'first' and 'second'. Ferrier says—'A system of philosophy is bound by two main requisitions—it ought to be true, and it ought to be reasoned. Of these obligations,

the (latter) 'second' is the more stringent.' The sense to be conveyed by 'former' and 'latter' and the other expressions is 'the first mentioned of the two subjects', 'the second or last mentioned of the two'; and the aptest condensation of this is 'first-named, second-named', 'first, second.' 'Former' and 'latter' introduce the extraneous circumstance of succession in time; they are suitable when there is actually such a reference; 'former kings', 'latter kings'; 'former years', 'latter years'.

In the following example, three subjects are referred to by the numerals, 'first', 'second', 'third': 'We shall never have true knowledge of the schools of the middle ages, until those who have studied both (?) their *philosophy*, their *physics*, and their *state of tradition*, will look at their weapons of controversy as both offensive and defensive, and give a fair account of the amount of protection afforded by the *first*, in the existing state of the *second* and 'the' *third*.' This is much too difficult to follow. We might say—'until those that have studied, on the one hand, their philosophy, and, on the other hand, their physics and their state of tradition, will———protection afforded by the philosophy to the physics, and to, &c'.

The following is from Bishop Butler's Sermon on Compassion: 'The social nature of man, and general good-will to his species, equally prevent him from doing evil, incline him to relieve the distressed, and to promote the positive happiness of his fellow-creatures; but compassion only restrains from the *first*, and carries him to the *second*; it hath nothing to do with the *third*.' Hearers could not be expected to make the distinctive references here demanded. Indeed, all references whose meaning depends on the hearer's observing the *position* of the antecedents, are peculiarly unsuitable to *oral* address, and should, if possible, be excluded from it, even though tolerated in writing.

Our adjectives of reference include 'the present', 'the above', 'foregoing', 'the one in question', 'the following'—which are more distinctive than 'this' and 'that'.

The ellipsis of the noun, whereby the demonstrative

adjectives assume the character of pronouns, is a very general process of the language. It occurs even with adjectives of quality. Speaking of an assemblage of persons, we say 'the *old* conversed, the *young* danced or played'. So 'the rich', 'the poor', 'the noble' are abbreviations, a noun being understood. Still oftener do we suppress the noun with adjectives of quantity. 'All is lost', 'many will depart', 'none remain'.

Our ARTICLES have the force of Adjectives, while they are also adjectives in their origin.

The chief point of grammatical importance of the INDEFINITE ARTICLE is its being the sign of the singular number of common nouns. When a general or common noun in the singular is used without either article, there is something to be explained.

The article is not superseded by an adjective of quality; we must say '*a* rich man', '*a* white horse'. It is superseded by certain other adjectives, as follows:—

1. 'Any' takes the place of the indefinite article, by stating the same meaning still more emphatically. 'Bring me *a* knife' means no knife in particular, *any* knife.

2. The demonstratives 'this', 'that', dispense with the article by changing the meaning; '*this* book' negatives *a* book, or any book.

3. The same reason applies to the possessives; '*my* book' renders the noun definite.

4. 'One' also renders a noun more definite than the article, and so supersedes it. So may 'some'; '*some* day you will know'.

5. 'Every', 'each', 'either', 'neither', are incompatible with 'a' or 'an'.

6. The adverbial adjective 'no' excludes the article. This is because it already contains an equivalent—being by derivation, as well as in meaning, 'not one'. (See p. 106.)

7. The indefinite article cannot be used in an address—'Wretch, I dare thee'. The reason still is incompatibility of meaning.

The indefinite article is superseded by the definite—'the'. In using 'the' we have not the same means of discriminating between the common and the other nouns; for, excepting Proper Names, 'the' is applied to all kinds of nouns:—we can say—'the man', 'the goodness', 'the gold'.

There are certain instances of omission of the article that need to be accounted for.

We say 'man is mortal'; 'poet and philosopher alike employ—'; 'beast and bird their common charge attend—'. In such instances, the singular seems to have a personifying effect, in the way of binding up a whole class into an individual possessed of the class attributes; energy is supposed to be gained by saying 'man' for men, 'beast' for beasts.

'Government resolved', for '*the* government', in like manner regards the government as an individual, and converts the name into a singular name. 'Society' is an abstraction personified.

Another case is exemplified thus: 'He became captain'; 'he was elected chairman of the company'; 'when Chatham was minister'; 'I once sat with Major Abercrombie, son of the immortal general' (Scott). These instances are supposed to be too definite for the indefinite article; and if an article is to be given, it must be the definite. Similar instances are—'head of the family', 'baker to Her Majesty', 'brother to the Earl of Cork', 'doctor of medicine', 'bishop of London', 'professor of Mathematics'. All such forms are used as *complements*, or in *apposition*; they cannot stand as subjects, or as objects.

The common phrase—'the rank of major', is extended by De Quincey to 'the hereditary rank of gentleman'. There is here a certain dignity imparted by leaving out the indefinite article. We address an officer 'Major Brown', meaning 'Brown, who is a major'; and the same curtailing process is applied to express 'the rank of major'.

'In position' is a verbal abstract noun. 'The punishment of *fine*' is the same as 'fining'.

'Opinion of *counsel*' is a recognised omission Some ten-

dency to conceive 'counsel' in the abstract may be supposed to be the motive.

'The relation of mother and child, master and servant, ruler and ruled'—is a case where the common nouns express an abstract idea, which appears to justify the leaving out of the indefinite article.

In a few English idioms, as, 'brought to table', 'leaving town', 'going to school', 'in church', 'down hill', the ruling circumstance seems to be the desire of shortness. So, 'the end of next session' might be '*the* next session'; omission of 'the' does not cause any ambiguity or inconvenience.

The DEFINITE ARTICLE is a weakened 'that' with the characteristics of the demonstrative. 'That' applies to something seen, or something just pointed out by some other means. It may also apply to something yet to be defined by a relative clause; which clause being restrictive should have the restricting relative: '*that* man *that* you see', commonly given as 'that man *whom* you see'. The older and better idiom is '*the* man *that*'. The definite article is nothing in itself; it is a pointing word, and what it points to is given in the first instance by a relative clause to follow; 'the book that you wish', 'the shop that we have passed', 'the star that bids the shepherd fold'. By the curtailments of the clause we reach the participial phrase, and then the adverbial phrase, the commonest of all ways of signifying the reference of the article; 'the clock in the steeple', 'the way to glory', 'the tower of London. The vague preposition 'of' answers the purpose.

The mode of employing 'the' to single out objects in an understood collection or environment is illustrated in the grammar; and is a remarkable instance of our omitting essential particulars because they are known to the hearer.

In employing 'of' to connect a part with a whole, or an abstract quality with its concrete subject, 'the' is essential; '*the* roof of the house', 'the oxygen of the air', '*the* length

of the room', 'the graciousness of the act', 'the justice of God'.

There is a delicacy in using 'the' as a milder form of 'that', in which case it may have the backward reference. Speaking of a museum, instead of 'that collection was formed', we say '*the* collection was formed'. 'Did you meet Brown's bull? I passed *the* brute.'

In expressing singular or individual objects by limiting a common noun, the Pronoun Adjectives are the most effective. A demonstrative, as 'this' or 'that', suffices at once: '*this* man', '*that* house', '*the* fire', '*yon* aged thorn'. Possessives, we saw, have a great limiting power: '*my* hat', '*our* country'. The Definite Article, in all its applications, tends to individuality: 'the reigning Sultan', 'the day of reckoning', 'the moonlight'.

THE VERB.

The definition of the Verb was discussed in the Introduction. I shall here consider, first—

THE CLASSIFICATION OF VERBS.

The old definition—'be, do, suffer'—might be supposed to be merely chargeable with the mistake of classifying instead of defining. But even in this point of view it is faulty. The first designation 'be' or 'being' may pass for the Incomplete verbs, of which the verb 'be' is the leading example; but the distinction of 'doing' and 'suffering' does not mark two classes of verbs in grammar. There is no grammatical difference between 'he stirs the fire' (doing), and 'he feels the cold' (suffering). If good for anything, these two designations point to the difference between the active and the passive voice (acting and being acted on), and yet they do not give a good account of that distinction.

For the ends of grammar, verbs are classified into Transitive, Intransitive, and Incomplete or Copula Verbs.

Transitive Verbs.

These verbs in construction have subject, verb, and object. To appearance, this arrangement is devoid of the simplicity of the verbs (Intransitive) that do not need an object. 'I open the door', combines three things; 'the door opens' has only two things. Yet the first form is intrinsically more simple and intelligible; and the transitive verb is the best point of departure in studying verbs.

Although Action is not the defining circumstance of the verb, yet undoubtedly verbs, more than any other part of speech, are used for expressing activity, agency, causation, change. When the putting forth of energy is stated by a noun or an adjective, this is generally by derivation from a verb. 'A walk', 'a run', 'a fight', 'thunder', 'impulse', —are nouns, but they begin as verbs; and the full expression of the fact is by a sentence made up of verb and subject, with or without an object: 'I walk', 'John runs', 'Jupiter thunders', 'Cæsar fought the Gauls', 'fear impelled him'.

The active operations that we conceive most easily and clearly are such as are presented to us by naming, first, an agent or subject, next, a verb expressing some kind of action, and, lastly, an object acted on: 'he stirs the fire'. This is our earliest and most familiar experience of activity; the child, whether watching the actions of others, or following out its own, becomes accustomed to this course or cycle of a completed action. If an action begins without an agent (in the first instance, a person), or if it does not communicate itself to some object, there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and incompleteness.

Thus, then, the transitive type is the most simple and intelligible form; when we wish to describe an effect in the plainest manner, we can do nothing better than cast the description into a sentence with subject, verb, and object: 'Columbus discovered America', 'Solomon built the temple, and ruled Israel'; the sun warms and lights the earth'; 'corn and wine cheer mankind'.

Intransitive Verbs.

'The rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew'; 'we run'; 'Victoria reigns', 'the sun rises', 'man dies',—are the simplest type of sentence if we look at the fewness of the parts, but are more abstruse when we set ourselves to grasp the meaning. The sentence confined to subject and verb does not precede the sentence formed by subject, verb, and object, but rather grows out of this by omitting a part. Let us review the different sorts of intransitive verbs.

1. In one class, the action ends in the agent's self, or puts self in motion: 'I sit, stand, lie, jump, shout'—express myself acting, as it were, upon myself. My own will is the agent, my own body is moved; I do not use the full transitive form, which would be to name myself as object; I stop short with the name for the action. The old languages provided, for this situation, an inflection called the middle voice, still existing in some, and being the immediate origin of the passive voice.

These examples give the voluntary actions of living beings. Life, however, is made up of a great number of involuntary actions and changes, expressed by such verbs as 'breathe', 'perspire', 'grow', 'feel', 'sicken', 'die'. In such cases, there is an internal, unknown power; what we know is the outward form of the action, and the subject put in motion: 'he breathes', 'he died', do not express 'he' as an agent originating an action, but gives the subject that comes under the action.*

Such a case approaches to the mode of expressing the powers of the external world, which are stated, in a large

* 'A blood vessel burst' is a usual construction with an intransitive verb; while '*he* burst a blood vessel' would very likely be parsed as an ordinary example of the transitive construction. Yet a regard to the meaning shows this to be wrong; he might burst a gun by overloading, but not one of his own blood vessels. The apparent subject should be in the position of an adverbial clause—'a blood vessel burst in him, in his body'. Any one causing hæmorrhage by taking violent exercise might not improperly be put forward as the subject or agent in the transitive construction.

number of instances, by intransitive verbs, as being most suited to the case. 'The sun rises, sets, moves.' We cannot describe this by a transitive verb; there is no agent or subject propelling the sun; it has self-motion (in appearance). 'A stone falls', 'the earth goes round', 'trees germinate, grow, decay', 'fruit ripens', 'swallows migrate', 'men laugh'. Immanent or inherent action evades the transitive construction, until, by communicating itself, it sets something in motion, or induces change in some extraneous object. 'The wind blows', 'the sea advances', 'the tide rises'—express the inhering power of the agent; 'the wind drives the mill' expresses communicated motion by the transitive form.

2. The second case is the suppressing of the special object, by making the action general. This is an elliptical form, less simple than the full transitive form. 'The king reigns, governs', is an abbreviation for 'the king governs the country'. 'Fire burns', 'industry enriches,' 'punctuality pays', 'virtue elevates', 'men will, think, understand, speak, teach'; 'to tyrannise, to generalise, to perorate, dissent, disagree, shot, smoke, ring',—are a few examples among many. These verbs, in expressing a general fact instead of a special incident, presuppose numerous instances of the transitive construction with the object stated. 'Fire burns wood, coal, peat, buildings', and so on; by omitting the special substance, we give the fact generally, 'fire burns'.

3. In expressing situation, order, arrangement, quiescent position, we sometimes use the intransitive construction, supplemented occasionally by adverbs. 'The town *stands* high—lies low—stretches out lengthwise'.

By a figurative or fictitious process, still life is represented as the effect of some agency, which gives it the higher intelligibility of the transitive construction. We may vivify the description of a garden, by putting forward the person that planned and made it, and by pourtraying it in a series of actions emanating from him.

Incomplete Verbs.

This title designates the verb 'be', and a few others that express meanings so general, that they need an adjective or a noun to express a definite action. Such are—seem, become, make, lie, rest, stand, get, elect, name, choose, appoint, nominate, grow, appear. 'Is' has a meaning, as bare existence, but instead of being confined to this attenuated notion, it lends itself as a verb to convert a mere adjective or noun into a predicate: 'he *is* warm'. It thus contributes the form of predication, while some other word, not a verb, gives the meaning predicated.

So the words 'seem', 'become', 'appear', have but a vague signification in themselves; they possess, however, the prerogative of the verb, and when a more expressive word is supplied, they coin a predicate. In meaning they are often very little different from 'is'.

'Make' is a very general word, and often needs to be completed by a noun or adjective as well as by its proper object. The maker needs a material to work upon, and a type to conform to; and when both are given, we have either a double object or a completion of the verb. 'Conscience makes us cowards'; 'cold makes us ill'; 'care makes us well'; 'books make me a denizen of all nations'.

The words 'get', 'lie', 'set', 'rest', &c., have sufficiently good meanings in their original, and even in their ordinary, acceptation. They are, however, all employed as completing words, giving predication to more significant nouns and adjectives. 'Get on, get along, get well out of that, get careless'; 'lie still', (hardly different from '*be* still'); 'set free', 'rest assured'.

In the classical languages, the double-object verbs lead to a great many specific rules, owing to the variations of case; in our language, they need very little attention. The names 'direct' and 'indirect' have been given to express the two objects; but there is often a want of any test to discriminate the two. In the passive construction, either may in many cases be a nominative: 'he teaches me grammar',

'he asked me a question'; in the passive, 'I am taught', 'grammar is taught', 'I was asked', 'the question was asked'. 'He recommends me to try the Vichy waters': 'I am recommended to try', 'the Vichy waters are recommended.' The second form is the more strictly correct; the first is somewhat of a licence.

The Incomplete Verbs are not, as a class, distinct from the two other classes—Transitive and Intransitive; they usually fall under one or other of these two classes. 'They *made* him Consul': the incomplete verb 'make' is also a transitive verb, with 'him' as object: 'they *consulized* him'. 'He *grows* tall': 'grows' is intransitive, as well as incomplete.

The properties of natural objects and the laws of nature are expressed oftener by 'is', and some adjective or noun, than by any other form of language. 'Gold is heavy', 'oxygen is a gas', 'man is intelligent', 'love is blind'. In this capacity it is called the copula verb.*

From the same vagueness in its own intrinsic meaning, it serves as the auxiliary for forming tenses in conjunction with the participles, or adjective forms of verbs.

Nouns operating as Verbs.

A verb may be turned into a noun, and may serve as the subject or the object of the sentence like any other noun; the verb 'change' may become subject or object, and may enter into an adverbial phrase, thus: '*change* is not to be desired for the sake of *change*'. There are hundreds of such nouns in the language. In parsing, all that needs to be said of them is that they are *nouns* derived from verbs.

The examples that we are now to notice are of far more importance. While a verb in becoming a noun loses all its power of predication, it often retains, in a more or less disguised way, the other grammatical functions of the verb; it may have an object, or a subject, and it may be qualified by an adverb.

* For the various logical uses of 'is', see De Morgan's Formal Logic, p. 50.

First, as to retaining an Object. The least disguised form of the object is the *Noun Clause*, of which the examples are notorious. The verbal construction, 'I believe that he is right', becomes often 'I have *the belief* that he is right'. The word 'believe,' in becoming 'belief', is no longer a predicate, yet in other respects it plays its former part; the *object* clause, 'that he is right', remains adhering to the noun, exactly as to the verb. Instances of this kind are abundant. Such verbal nouns as 'proof', 'assurance', 'sense', 'apprehension', 'conviction', 'observation', 'remark', 'knowledge', 'promise', 'thought'—can all be construed on the same plan; and they are not fully parsed unless the circumstance be stated. 'We gave him a *hint* that he was not wanted', stands for 'we hinted that'; 'hint' should be parsed as a verbal noun retaining part of the function of the transitive verb, and the clause should be stated to be its object.

The following are other examples:—'There arose a *dispute among them, who should be greatest*'. Everything belonging to the transitive verb is retained, the power of predication being passed to 'arose'; '*they* disputed *who should be greatest*'; the object clause is unchanged, the subject is transformed into the adverbial phrase *among them*. Pupils might be exercised in restoring such constructions.

'I *doubt whether*', is often given as 'I have *a doubt* whether'. 'Generally when a *discussion* arises, whether anything is or is not'. 'Bring me *word* [what boats and people he can command.]' 'I am going to yonder gate to receive further *direction* [how I may get to the place of deliverance.]' 'He gave us a long *account* [how he had hooked the fish, played with it]' &c., *i.e.*, he *detailed* at length *how* &c., or such like.

The object appears as an *Infinitive* in the following:—'To the overtures of the Emperor he replied by a persistent *refusal* (by persistently refusing) to enter his service'. 'My kind landlady gave me the best *advice* (advised me) how to behave in the execution of my project'.

A *Noun* object may still adhere to a transmuted verb,

but a preposition is then prefixed; chiefly 'of', and occasionally some others. 'The *knowledge* of geometry' is 'knowing geometry'; (an *infin.* object) 'the knowledge of how to do it', knowing how to do it'; 'enumeration of particulars', 'enumerating'. '*Degeneration* of *tissue* is going on' is translated 'tissue is degenerating'; the verb is intransitive, and the noun 'tissue' is the subject. Or, for a strict noun object, 'some cause not specified *is degenerating tissue*'. 'The most important event of the session was the *passing* of the Act for the *settling* of Schools'; 'was *passing* (or that the Legislature *passed*) *the Act* for *settling* (or whereby they *settled*) Schools'. 'Procrastination is the *thief* of time'; procrastinating steals (makes away with) time'.

'You are welcome to the *use* of (to use) my library'.

'The *suggestion as to* making an abstract' is 'suggesting to make an abstract'.

Next, as to retaining the Subject.

'*Fall* of the year' is 'the year falls, is falling'. Examples are furnished in all transformed intransitive verbs: 'the *rushing* of great *rivers*—great *rivers* rush'.

The subject of the verb appears as a Possessive. '*John failed*, which astonished them'; '*John's failure* astonished them'. '*Your* speech is not *his* answer to *my* question'; 'What you said is not what he answered to what I asked'. '*Our* contention was that the agreement stood'; 'we contended', 'what we contended for was'.

Lastly, as to Adverbial adjuncts. In the least transformed shape, these appear as phrases, and are generally the very same that accompany the verb. 'They were *dissatisfied with the result*' becomes '*dissatisfaction* with the result'. So '*perseverance unto the end*', for 'persevere unto the end'; 'cowardice *in the field*', 'being a coward'; 'a *situation* in the place', 'situated'. 'He was an *impostor* in the one thing that people trusted to him', 'he imposed, in the one thing'. 'We should incur a *contradiction* in terms', 'we should *contradict*'. '*Conversation with you* has satisfied me', contracted from '*Conversing* with you', or, at length, 'I have conversed with you, and I am satisfied'.

'I had often received an *invitation* from my friend, Sir Roger de Coverley (my friend *had* often *invited* me) *to pass away* a month with him in the country'.

When the adverbial adjunct is a single word, it becomes an adjective to the verbal noun. The disguise is now so complete, that, in parsing, we never think of laying it open. Given the clause—'there was *general* dissatisfaction with the result', we should have to retrace thus—'they were *generally* dissatisfied'. 'Let us proceed by *simple* enumeration', 'by enumerating *simply*'. 'Knowledge is power'; 'extensive knowledge is extensive power'; for 'if we *know extensively*, we shall *operate extensively*'. 'Mental cultivation' is 'being cultivated *mentally*, or as regards the mind'; or the adjective may become simply the object of the verb, 'cultivating the mind'. So 'this knowledge' is a form of saying 'knowing this'. 'Imaginary conversations' is 'imagined persons conversing'—a still greater distortion. 'Great expectations' is 'great things expected'. 'Both courses were equal surprises', were 'equally surprises' (the simple adverb qualifying a noun), 'equally surprising'. 'Contemporary registration', 'registering by a contemporary', or by some person or persons at the time. 'Make personal enquiries', 'enquire in person'. 'House to house visitation', 'visiting from house to house'.

'I have had a *good sleep*' is a Scotticism for 'I have slept well'; 'a good rest', is 'rested well'.

The transformation of a verb into a noun expressing the actor often retains the verb accompaniments. The object is given by means of the preposition 'of'. 'He accused the brethren', 'he was the *accuser of the brethren*'. With an adverb, 'he vehemently accused', 'he was a *vehement accuser*'. 'He was an ardent solicitor of posts', 'he *ardently solicited*'. 'Who is the *best translator* of the Pentateuch?' 'Who best translates'. 'An *extensive* owner' is very figurative and distorted—'one that owns extensive domains'; in like manner, 'large or small proprietors'. 'A dealer in horses', for 'he deals in horses'. 'The inundation of lawless power', 'lawless power inundating' ('lawless power' is itself a trans-

formation 'controlling lawlessly'). 'Resumption of the general war'; 'the general war resumed'; 'fighting generally recommenced',

The motives for transforming the verb in this manner are obvious. A verb as a predicate must appear in a full sentence; hence each action that we wish to express needs a clause to itself. Now we have often to accumulate a great many actions in few words; it is convenient, therefore, if practicable, to express some by nouns, which may fall into their places as subjects, objects, or adverbial phrases in sentences; whence, one complete sentence or clause may include several actions.

The following is an example in point: 'A *fall* through 16 feet begets a velocity of 32 feet'; 'after a body *has fallen* through 16 feet, it *moves* at the rate of 32 feet in the same time'. The short form will be preferred in composition; the other has the air of a paraphrase, and yet it does not bring out fully that the sequence is one of cause and effect.

'The *equality of* the three angles of a triangle to two right angles is a *previous* assumption'; 'it is previously assumed that the three angles of a triangle are equal—'.

It has to be borne in mind, however, that there is a loss of *simplicity* by thus condensing clauses into nouns; for which reason the operation should not be carried farther than the occasion requires. It is a good exercise in style to restore the full verb constructions, and to see in each case, whether, or how far, it was right to depart from them.

The following are additional examples:

'The *mixture* of *inference* with *observation* is a *cause* of *error*.' Here are five verbal nouns, each stating an action of sufficient importance to occupy a clause. Converting them all unto verb forms,—'if we mix inferring and observing we shall cause ourselves to err' Even the infinitives although not predicating words are a step in the right direction; they are more suggestive of action, than the noun, whose prime function it is to name things without reference to their action—a stone, a star, a city. In the attempt to restore such sentences, we often find a way of reducing an excess

of verbal abstract nouns. 'If we infer and observe together, we shall be misled', is a great improvement in simplicity, if not so technically precise as the original.

The laws of nature can give no account of their own *origin*'; 'do not account for their own originating', 'do not tell how they themselves arose'.

'A *fine* is no sufficient punishment to the rich'. 'Fining does not sufficiently punish the rich'.

'Copernicus asserted the *rotation* of the earth about its axis' 'That the earth rotates'.

'We *walk* by faith, not by *sight*'. 'In walking, we do not see, but believe'; 'we walk, not seeing, but believing'.

'An apparatus was constructed by which the *requirements* of the animal were accommodated;' 'by which the animal obtained what it required'.

'*Humble origin* is no bar to the attainment of greatness; while *pride of birth* is a frequent cause of humiliation'. 'Being humbly born does not keep one from attaining greatness (becoming great), while one that is highly born and proud is frequently humiliated thereby'.

'Master Fodge had no distinct *vision* of the *benefit* that would accrue to him from this *change* of *courses*'. There are here four verbal abstracts, and all might be dispensed with. 'Master Fodge did not *distinctly see* what he would *gain*, if he *behaved differently*'.

'It is only the *study* and *apprehension* of their vital and organic *connection* which is valuable in an educational point of view'. 'Only when we study and apprehend that they are connected vitally and organically, do we see that they educate well'.

'Of the same nature with the *indulgence* of domestic affections, and equally refreshing to the spirits, is the pleasure which results from acts of *bounty* and *beneficence*, exercised either in giving money, or in imparting to those who want it the *assistance* of our skill and profession'. 'Of the same nature as when we indulge our domestic affections, and equally exhilarating, is our pleasure in being

bountiful and beneficent, either in giving money, or in assisting with our professional skill those that want it'.

'Solomon is the work to which he entrusted the protection of his name'. An excess of verbs and verbal nouns. 'Through his Solomon he hoped to become celebrated'.

'His praise endures for ever', 'They praise him for ever'.

'Britannia needs (no) 'not' bulwarks
(No) 'Nor' towers along the steep,
(Her march is) 'She marches' o'er the mountain waves,
(Her home is on) 'She dwells upon' the deep'.'

The foregoing alterations are not given as, in every respect, improving the passages quoted; they are intended to point out how far we can go in restoring the simple construction by the finite verb, in room of the abstract nouns; while in many instances, the gain in simplicity is compatible with all other good qualities.

Adjectives as Verbs.

Instead of a verb, transitive or intransitive, we have frequently an adjective, united with the verb 'be'. This is a perfectly regular process of the language, in the two following constructions:—

First, in the compound tenses of the verb, which are made up of auxiliaries and participles; 'I am *coming*', 'he is *moved*'.

Second, in predicating facts or attributes expressed by adjectives: 'the wine is *good*', 'the stars are *distant*'.

The ordinary or typical adjective may be qualified by an adverb (chiefly of degree)—'*very* good', '*extremely* remote'; or even by a phrase—'good *to a slight extent*', 'remote *in a very great degree*'. But in such expressions, we feel that the adjective is trenching closely upon the verb. As regards 'good', the most typical of adjectives, the phrase adjunct is perceptibly inelegant and awkward; while 'remote' scarcely differs from 'removed', the participle of a verb.

Adjectives of comparison are incomplete without an

adjunct to express what the comparison is; 'superior', 'inferior', 'equal', are followed by 'to' and the thing compared. The comparative and superlative degrees of all adjectives need to be similarly completed; 'sweeter than honey', 'best of beings'.

Fitness and unfitness likewise need a completing phrase, whether expressed by a verb, by an adjective, or by a noun. The verb form gives the cue, which is followed out in the other transformations. 'They *are qualified* for the work', 'they *are fit* for', 'they *possess fitness* for'. So with Proportion: 'proportioned to', 'in proportion to', 'bearing no proportion to'.

'Are you *guilty of* the crime charged?' Here 'guilty' is by accident an adjective, but in its nature it is a verb, and is completed by an adverbial adjunct. 'Do you *admit* the charge'? shows the typical verb form, which might have been taken as the model in the other expression.

The instances where the verb appears as an adjective without special justification are such as these: 'He is *dependent*', for 'he depends'; 'a circumstance *suggestive* of', for 'suggesting' or 'that suggests'. Such adjectives are followed by the same phrases as the verbs. 'I am not *sure* which', is for 'I do not know which'.

The sentence, 'Be kindly affectioned one to another', is curiously transformed. The noun 'affection' is made a participle of a verb; the adjective 'kind' being turned into an adverb to qualify the compound tense.

THE ADVERB.

To discover the true nature of the Adverb, we must look at the Verb in its prevailing and typical character as indicating some kind of activity. Although action does not exhaust the predicating power of the verb, it is the thing that we must always start from. It belongs to the great mass of predications openly and avowedly; it is found in

many others by implication; and even where it is wanting, the grammatical usage of the adverb is not essentially changed.

When an action is stated, mention has usually to be made of the circumstances of the action, such as the time and manner of it. So generally is the time demanded, that the verb itself incorporates the leading distinctions of time, as present, past, future. The Germans call the verb Time-word (Zeitwort).

Nevertheless, for a very large class of verbs, there is a circumstance more urgent even than time. Action implies movement or change: a transitive verb expresses a certain action taking place upon a certain object—'I draw water', 'bring the man'; and, to be complete, we must often assign some *Direction* of the action or movement—I draw water *from* somewhere, bring the man *to* somewhere. These words of direction are among the first necessities of language; they are the most essential accompaniments of the verb. They are, in fact, the Prepositions. But a preposition by itself is seldom definite enough; it gives a direction vaguely, but does not indicate the terminus. To supply this, we need a noun as the name of some object or landmark: 'I draw water *from the well*', 'bring the man *to me*'. Such is the adverbial phrase of direction, by far the most usual mode of informing us of the whence or the whither of any movement, activity, or change. Indeed, for qualifying verbs, in all ways, the phrase is much oftener used than the simple adverb. Examine a paragraph taken at random; and if you except the recurring words—not, only, there—for one adverb in a single word, you will find at least ten adverbial phrases.

The phrases made up of preposition and noun are thus the means of expressing Direction. But they do much more. This circumstance of direction, which is the meaning of the simple prepositions, is metaphorically employed for many other meanings. For example, Agency has very frequently to be stated along with an action: 'raised *by him*'. Now, to express the agent, we use the prepositions of close proximity, as 'by', 'with', 'through'; in naming what

stood by when the action took place, we suggest who did it. Again, the primary circumstance of Time, is expressed, in its more minute indications, by prepositional phrases: '*in* the night', '*at* one o'clock'; the prepositions, from signifying position in space, being transferred to position in time.

Another circumstance of actions is *Degree*. Movements, changes, effects, have all varieties of energy or intensity, and when this is expressed, it constitutes an adverbial adjunct. As we have Adjectives of degree, so we have Adverbs; indeed there are a few words, such as 'much', 'little', 'first', that serve both as adjectives and as adverbs. But, as with all the other adverbial circumstances, the phrases far outnumber the words.

Connected with Degree is *Excellence* or its opposite. We have frequent occasion to signify approbation or disapprobation of actions, and we have a class of words for the purpose—well, ill, badly, wretchedly; together with innumerable phrases.

The wide variety of circumstances included under *Manner* or *Quality*, and comprising the great body of adverbial adjuncts, find expression by very promiscuous means. It is well known that most Adjectives can be turned into adverbs, and that we thus obtain a very large number of our single-word adverbs. To understand fully the reason of this transmutation, we must begin a stage earlier, with the verb itself. Many of the adjectives that give birth to adverbs, are formed from verbs, and the force of the verb is passed over to the adverb. Take a few examples:—'they ran *distractedly*'; 'he was promoted *deservedly*'; 'we were *delightfully* surprised'; 'that was *inadvertently* done'; 'such things are *laboriously* executed'; 'walk *circumspectly*'; 'this has been *ridiculously* ascribed'. Obviously, all these adverbs could be given as a second clause; 'they ran, and *were distracted*'; 'he was promoted, and *deserved* it'; 'we were surprised and *delighted*'; 'that was done, and *was not adverted to*'; 'people *labour* when they execute such things'; 'walk and *look well around* you'; 'this has been ascribed, and we *ridicule* it'.

Such is one of the ways of compressing sentences into single words, and of shortening speech, while at the same time making it less simple and easy to follow. As in the case of verbs turned into nouns, the change may be made recklessly as well as usefully, and so, now and then, we may, with profit, restore the original clause.

Hence when *participial* adjectives are converted into Adverbs, we might go at once to the fountain-head, and call it the conversion of verbs into adverbs. Of adjectives not in the participial form, there are yet a great many that come from verbs; such are the verbals in 'ble', and some in 'al', as 'continual', 'actual'; and we may say of these also, that they take over the action of one verb to qualify another verb; putting, as it were, two actions into one: 'he was *unaccountably* absent', 'he was absent and we could not account for it'.

Most probably all our adjectives began as verbs; they certainly began as words for active agency, just as their meaning still involves some power or efficacy to do something or another. 'Warm' means the power of imparting heat; 'good', 'bad', 'worse', when going with a noun, add a new power to the thing expressed by the noun, and the meaning might be given by a predicate verb. But, in order to explain the sources of the adverb, we need not go so far back as this. We may regard these typical adjectives as expressing their meaning by intrinsic right as adjectives, and not as masked or concealed verbs. Now we know that all adjectives may constitute predicates, by the help of copula verbs; 'John is wise', 'the men were brave'. Well, suppose John to be a judge, and to decide a difficult case with approbation: here are two facts to be expressed, and we may give a clause to each, 'John judged a case', and 'John is wise'. If, however, we can stick the word 'wise' into the first clause, we may show our meaning in a single statement: 'John judged a case *wisely*'. The incorporating of the two facts has not merely the advantage of brevity, it has the farther advantage of connecting 'wise' with the act of judging. So 'the men fought', and 'the men were

brave', are combined into the single declaration, 'the men fought *bravely*'.

A great deal could be said on the making up of the Adverbial phrase; but in principle there is nothing new. We may have a simple noun or pronoun with a preposition, as 'at home', 'to me', 'in London', 'with care', 'from fear', 'by diligence', 'on credit', 'of course': a noun with an article, demonstrative, or other adjective prefixed—'in an hour', 'by that means', 'through a long day', 'in regular order', 'from different causes', 'after many severe struggles': and still higher complications—'in the circumstances of a large town', 'under the genial influences of spring', 'in the course of the recent trial for perjury', 'above the average of similar cases', 'beyond the reach of human injustice'.

In such an example as 'we behold *with amazement*', there is the obvious compression of a second clause, 'we behold and we are *amazed*'; it might have been, 'we *amazedly* behold'. The phrase is more euphonious than the single word, and that is the whole difference. The compression of a predicate verb into a phrase is more frequent than the compression into a single word, from the very fact that phrases far outnumber simple adverbs.

CLASSIFICATION OF ADVERBS.

We are now in a position to discuss the grammatical reasons for laying out the Adverbs into distinct classes. The following classification may be justified as suiting the ends of Grammar:—

I.—Place and Direction.
II.—Time.
III.—Degree.
IV.—Affirmation and Denial, Belief and Disbelief, or modes of Certainty and Uncertainty.
V.—Manner or Quality.

I.—*Place and Direction.*

There are various reasons for making a separate class of adverbs of Direction and Place. Such adverbs are formed from the primitive words of direction, serving as prepositions and as adverbs alike; they are needed to characterize the line of movement or change under the working of active powers.

But the philological origin of a species of words, however interesting in itself, is not always a good reason for forming a grammatical class. There are, however, two other valid reasons for keeping up a subdivision of adverbs of Place.

The first is that they are a small select number, perpetually recurring; in this respect they resemble pronouns (from which indeed some are derived), prepositions, and conjunctions. They may be enumerated individually, and their meanings learned in the practice of grammar. The pronoun group—here, there, hither, hence, &c.—and the prepositions, form the great bulk of the simple adverbs of place and direction.

The second reason is the great and general importance of the circumstance of place or locality in narrating or describing events. To call the attention of pupils to the words and phrases that localize any incident imparts a discipline both in conceiving fully, and in expressing clearly. '*From the Vatican*, the popes issue their commands to the Catholic Church'.

II.—*Time.*

The reasons for giving pupils the trouble of parsing separately adverbs of Time, are the same as those now stated for place.

First. The single words for Time are few in number, and frequently occurring; and it is not beyond the fair scope of Grammar to recite them individually, and to assign their meanings. In their source, they do not present such peculiar groups as the adverbs of place obtained from the pronoun and the preposition. 'Before' and 'after' are formed from prepositions; the others are of various origin—now, soon, lately, ever, henceforth, presently, &c.

Second. Of equal importance with place, is the indication of Time as a circumstance of all incidents and events. Indeed, as regards narrative, Time claims priority of mention; the first thing regarding an event is the time or date; after that comes place, and finally the action itself, with any circumstances of manner generally.

The full working out of the expression of Time involves innumerable phrases made up of preposition and noun, the prepositions being diverted to position in time by an easy change from their original reference to direction and place. Chronology is expressed by the prepositions 'in', 'before', 'after', used with years, months, days; minuter divisions, as hours and minutes, are given by 'at', 'by', in addition to these.

III.—*Degree or Measure.*

There is a sub-division of Adjectives founded on Quantity; and there are equally good grounds for making a class of Adverbs for so essential a feature of active operations. Among the attributes or distinctions of things, a contrast is always made between Quantity and Quality; and though the mere grammatical necessity for maintaining the distinction is not overpoweringly strong, yet, as regards the sense or meaning of language, the utility of observing the distinction is incontestable.

These are the adverbs that are employed to qualify Adjectives and other Adverbs. But for them, we might define the Adverb as qualifying the verb solely. The meanings of nearly all Adjectives admit of change for degree; good, great, bad, wise, hot, sweet,—may have different grades of amount or intensity; and these grades are expressed by adverbs, 'very good', 'infinitely great', 'scarcely hot', 'slightly sweet'. So when adverbs themselves have to be varied in degree, the same adverbs are used: 'very much elated', 'exceedingly little affected'.

It is from the very nature of things that adverbs of place, time, and quality, cannot be applied to adjectives or other adverbs. We may say '*very* wise', but not 'loudly, calmly,

transparently, sweetly wise'. 'She was *distractingly* beautiful', exemplifies a common usage, namely, to take an adverb of quality for the purpose of suggesting degree. Many words of degree, whether adjectives or adverbs, in their first use, express some quality implying effects that are very great or very little. 'Astonishing', 'distracting', overpowering', 'heavenly'—are words for mental impressions caused by some very powerful agent; and we adopt them to signify mere degree or amount, leaving out the special manner of their operation, or the quality properly so called.

Of this nature are our most usual adverbs of degree—scarcely, moderately, fairly, exceedingly, utterly, terribly, thoroughly, extensively.

IV.—*Affirmation and Denial.*

By far the greatest distinction among predications, or declarations embodied in sentences or clauses, is the distinction between affirming and denying. This distinction attains its highest importance in logic or science; but it needs, for its expression, marked forms in Grammar.

An unchallenged affirmation does not need a special word or phrase; the subject and the predicate are given without any qualifying adjunct: 'the sea is deep', 'man is lord of the creation'. For complete denial, the leading word is 'not'; to attach this word to a predicate is totally to deny that the predicate applies to the subject; 'the sea is *not* still', 'man does *not* live for ever'.

In expounding the Adjective, we saw that 'not', the most genuinely adverbial word in the language is made to assume an adjective form, in 'no', 'none'; the pretexts being, first, to express universal denial, and, next, to give emphasis.

Affirmation is often modified or graduated, and the modifications are given by various adverbs and adverbial phrases. Sometimes we desire to affirm with energy and emphasis; for which we have the adverbs, 'certainly, surely, undoubtedly, &c.', with numerous phrases. When the affirma-

tion is not full, universal, or certain, there are limiting adverbs, as 'perhaps', with phrases expressive of various shades of probability.

Denial, or disbelief, is expressed by a number of phrases that embody the great particle of negation—'not at all', 'not in the least', 'by no means'; and by some other words, as 'rarely', 'scarcely', 'little', the adjective 'few', and phrases made up of it.

Negation can be transformed into equivalent affirmation, by finding a negative or obverse of the predicate; 'they are *not here*', 'they are gone *elsewhere*'. '*No* man is *perfect*', '*all* men are *imperfect*'; 'matter is *not self-moved*', 'matter is *moved from without*'. This is an operation of great significance in logic, and not without importance in Grammar; it is the mode of giving the reality apart from the form of negation, and should be familiar to those that are tracking out the varieties of English expression. General Havelock addressed his Indian army in these terms —'Soldiers, your labours, your privations, your sufferings, your valour *will not be forgotten* (will be remembered) by a grateful country'. The negative form is here chosen for emphasis; it is the case that people are in a more energetic mood when denying than when affirming; denial implies an opponent to fight; affirmation not necessarily so.

V.—*Manner or Quality.*

The foregoing classes have all some speciality possessing interest in Grammar. Taken together, they comprise but a small proportion of our adverbs; the large mass still remain, and, without farther grammatical discrimination, are called adverbs of Quality, or Manner. The sub-dividing of these might have a scientific interest, but would not be Grammar.

If any class could with advantage be detached from the great body of Quality adverbs, it would be the phrases for expressing *Cause*, Agency, or Instrumentality. There are few single-word adverbs employed for this meaning: the

'why' and the 'wherefore' are relative words applicable to cause; in general, we employ prepositions and nouns, 'by force', 'by cold', 'by persuasion', 'through fear', 'with an axe'.

The stating of Cause is a circumstance of great intrinsic importance as regards the meaning of a composition; but grammatically the interest is confined to the change from the active to the passive form of the transitive verb. In the active voice, the agent is the subject of the verb; in the passive voice, the object comes forward to that position, and the original subject is thrown into an adverbial phrase of agency. '*I* planted that tree'; 'that tree was planted *by me*'.

THE PREPOSITION.

The Classifying of Prepositions does not proceed from any strictly grammatical motive, like the classifying of Nouns, Pronouns, and Verbs. In Greek and Latin, there is a properly grammatical division of prepositions, according to the case that they govern. In English, they all govern one case.

When, therefore, we divide Prepositions under Place, Time, &c., we do so without any necessity arising out of Grammar. Our purpose is to assist the pupils in knowing the prepositions individually, and in using them according to their proper meanings. Excluding phrases, prepositions are limited in number—under forty; they are incessantly used; and it has become a part of Grammar to teach the different significations of each one of them.

Accordingly, the classification at once takes the shape of a list of uses or meanings; and the same preposition may be entered in several classes.

Prepositions, in their origin, supposed something in motion, and assigned the *Direction* of the motion: such are still the prominent meanings of 'to', 'from', 'up',

'down', &c. *Rest* in a place is expressed as the termination or the arrest of a movement; 'in' and 'on' mean direction first and place afterwards. As we have frequent need for stating position in place without saying by what cause the thing came to the place, we have appropriated certain prepositions to place alone, and have left others with their original meaning of direction. 'In', which in Latin has the two meanings—direction and place, is in English the chief preposition to signify resting quiescent in a given spot: 'in the house', 'in the British Museum', 'in Chancery'.

The preposition that most needs to be attended to, as most frequently causing indistinctness, is 'OF'.

Phrases with this preposition are the commonest of all; the reason being its extreme flexibility and vagueness. As already remarked (ADJECTIVE, p. 98), it does little more than state that two words are to be somehow connected or viewed together; the original meaning—'proceeding from'—being in most cases wholly abandoned. 'He has come *of* a good family' is an example of the real meaning; but what trace of that can be discovered in 'the bridge of sighs', 'an inspector of schools', 'a justice of peace', 'the theory of light'?

Owing to this extreme vagueness, the term 'Reference' meaning has been invented. To put 'of' between two nouns is scarcely more definite than placing them together without a preposition. From 'the sighs bridge' we might infer a bridge leading to some dolorous place; we extract no more from 'the bridge of sighs'. 'A school inspector' is about as suggestive as 'an inspector of schools'. This last, however, is the form adapted to convert a clause with an active verb—'he inspects schools'—into a phrase where the verb becomes a noun.

The original sense—'proceeding from'—is apparent in 'the word of God', 'the precepts of Moses', 'a statute of King Henry VIII.', 'the wine of France', 'men of Athens', 'the philosophy of Plato', 'the beasts of the field', 'the angels of heaven'.

In all these instances the second noun may be regarded as

naming the source of what is named by the first—'a statute emanating from Henry VIII.', 'men proceeding from, born in, Athens'.

To 'enquire of' is a clear case of source. More expressive, however, is 'ascertain *from*'.

'This tastes *of* garlic' is very remote from the primary sense. There is just a possibility of assigning the connection.

'He is frugal *of* his means', gives no more insight than might be got from 'he is means-frugal'.

The following instance looks like a struggle to adhere to the same meaning: 'Knowing, brethren beloved, your election *of* God' (1 Thessal. i. 4); 'your election coming from God, as its source'.

The superlative construction—the first of men, the wisest of kings, the last of the series—may be brought under the same meaning; the wisest that proceeds from the class of kings.

In the phrases—forgetful *of*, proud of, glad of, ashamed of, regardless of—I see no trace of the original meaning. Possibly these are imitations of Latin constructions with the genitive, which 'of' translates more frequently than any other preposition. Why do we say 'oblivious *to*'?

However we may explain the transition, 'of' is now chiefly employed in the sense of 'relating to', and therefore signifies the object or *end* of an action rather than its beginning or source. 'The theory of sound' is not a theory originating in, or emanating from, sound, but a theory directed to, or bearing upon, sound. 'The love of God' means, in the first instance, 'love proceeding from God', in the next place, 'love exercised towards God': the second meaning being the more usual. Compare 'the fear of God', which does not admit the first.

To show the range, and the consequent vagueness and ambiguity of this preposition, take the following constructions qualifying the same word 'law': law of God, of the land, of England, of the Scriptures, of honour, of sureties,

of landlord and tenant, of fishings, of mortmain, of primogeniture, and, lastly, of nature.

In some of the instances, the *source* of the law is indicated, in accordance with the primary meaning of the preposition —'law of God, law of the Scriptures' In others the specification is the *party* brought under the law—'sureties, landlord and tenant'' 'The law of England' contains both meanings—a law emanating from the constituted authorities of England and operating upon the population of England 'The law of fishings' does not directly mention the persons coming under the law, but gives the kind of property regulated. 'The law of primogeniture' mentions the *purport* or substance of the statute or the regulation imposed,—that in certain kinds of inheritance, the first-born (son) succeeds. 'The law of honour' specifies a fact different from any of the foregoing, namely, the *sanction*, or the means of enforcing the law, that is, by honour and dishonour, instead of fine, imprisonment, or death. The phrase 'law of nature' is the extreme instance; the ambiguity of the word 'nature' being an aggravation of the latitude accorded to the preposition.

'Have the laws *of* Induction the same evidence and necessity as the laws *of* Deduction?' 'Have the laws that govern the process Induction the same evidence and necessity as the laws that govern the process Deduction?'

In the following class of cases, we might consent to drop the 'of'. 'The name *of* the moral sense is not new'; 'the name *of* steam engine'; 'the epithets *of* the stony and sandy'. 'The name—moral sense', 'the name—steam engine', 'the epithets—stony and sandy'. The punctuation might be either the dash or inverted commas. Where the word commences with a capital letter, we could do without a stop: 'The title Cæsar', 'the designation Elector'.

'The town *of* Hamburg' is literally 'the town named Hamburg'; and might be 'the town Hamburg', or 'Hamburg town'; but 'Hamburg' alone ought to be sufficient. 'The empire of Austria' is a circumlocution for

'Austria', which means the empire. To be sure we may view Austria with reference more specifically to its government, or its territory, or its history; the 'of' would then be correctly used to mean a certain part or portion of Austria.

Dean Alford (The Queen's English, § 150) very naturally condemns as an affectation 'the first chapter of the *book Genesis*' and supposes the practice made consistent in this form: 'I left *the city* London, and passed through *the county* Kent, leaving *the realm* England at *the town* Dover, and entering *the empire* France at *the town* Calais, on my way to *the Republic* Switzerland'. He should have added, however, that all these words in Italics are unnecessary; and probably not one of them would be given in an actual letter. So we should say 'the first chapter of Genesis'. If we were to be very formal, we might say 'the book called Genesis,'; just as we say 'the Gospel according to St. John' There is a certain propriety in 'the city of London', as it means only a certain portion of London. There is a familiar usage—'Dublin city', 'county Kerry', 'Cork harbour', 'London docks'. We say 'the orator Cicero', 'the courtesan Lais', 'the boy Jones'.

'The practice of snuff-taking', 'the vice of idleness', 'the habit of obedience', 'the state of slavery', 'the complaint of pulmonary consumption' might be also written—'the practice—snuff-taking', 'the vice idleness', 'the habit obedience', 'the state—slavery', 'the state called slavery', 'the complaint or disease, pulmonary consumption'.

The following is curious as showing how far we may be carried by the laxity in using 'of'. 'Father Matthew, in Ireland, effected a reform, once deemed impossible, the reform *of* Temperance'. In the wide scope given to the preposition, as mere reference, or relation to, this would appear at first sight to be allowable, a reform connected with Temperance, as we might have a reform connected with frugality, with industry, or any other department of men's conduct in matters of good and evil. Yet, we feel that the expression really suggests reforming Temperance itself,

doing away with it, and making men *intemperate*. 'The reform of drunkenness' would be nearer the writer's intention. 'Reform of' would apply first to the source or author of the reform—the Reform of Cleisthenes, next to the persons or thing to be reformed—the Irish, the people, the law; if it applies to the subject matter of the reform, it should be followed rather by the vice to be removed, than by the virtue to be created: 'reform of indolence', 'of pleasure-loving', 'of inequalities'.

Such examples as 'house of detention', 'day of judgment', possess all the uncertainty of the use of a noun for an adjective: 'detention house', 'judgment day', would be equally appropriate.

It may be safely affirmed that to have this preposition occurring frequently indicates a loose disconnected style.

THE CONJUNCTION.

As with the Prepositions, the classing of Conjunctions has nothing to do with their grammatical employment; it is a help to explain their several meanings or uses. This alone justifies the seeming complicacy of the classification given in the Grammar. Complicated as it is, if it be good on its own principles, it makes the work of the pupil shorter than any simpler arrangement would do.

The delicacies of the Conjunctions are dwelt upon at some length in the Grammar. A fuller expansion would conduct us to the Rhetoric of the Sentence and the Paragraph, in which the appropriateness of the conjunctions chosen is all-important. (ENGLISH COMPOSITION and RHETORIC, p. 109.)

As regards composition generally, the greatest refinements and the most common inaccuracies attend the four simple conjunctions—AND, OR, BUT, IF.

AND. The chief nicety in connexion with 'and', when

cumulation is to be expressed, is to distinguish between the effect of using it and the effect of omitting it. To use it implies that the new statement is superadded to, and distinct from, the previous; to omit it is to signify that the new statement is in substance the same as the previous, or a mere varying of the expression.

'To a man who has no capital, who has laid by nothing—'. Here the second clause repeats the substance of the first; the conjunction is, therefore, left out. The presence of 'and' would signify or insinuate that 'who has laid by nothing' is a new circumstance, distinct from 'has no capital'; whereas the author means them to be identical.

'He was deeply conversant in the ancients, both Greek and Latin, *and* he borrowed boldly from them; ( ) there is scarce a poet or historian among the Roman authors whom he has not translated in Sejanus and Catiline'. The 'and' in the first member is strictly correct; 'borrowing boldly' is a fact additional to 'being conversant with'. Equally proper is the omitting of the conjunction at the commencement of the second member, which repeats in greater detail the same fact of borrowing.

'Ideas quickly fade, *and* often vanish quite out of the understanding, leaving no more footsteps or remaining characters of themselves than shadows do flying over a field of corn'. Better—'Ideas quickly fade; *they* often vanish, &c.'. The participle 'leaving' is correct; it has the same effect as 'they leave' without a conjunction. 'Pictures drawn in our mind are laid in fading colours; (and) unless sometimes refreshed, 'they' vanish (and) 'or' disappear'.

'A system of philosophy is bound by two main requisitions—it ought to be true *and* it ought to be reasoned'. The 'and' here is emphatic. The first clause is only a part of the case; and demands something of equal importance to be superadded. The emphasis is aided by the repetition of 'it ought to be'. Another mode is—'it ought to be *both* true *and* reasoned'. If a synonymous repetition of the first had been given, there would not have been a conjunction;

'it ought to be true, it ought to be free from error or mistake'.

'Man often loathes what he imitates, (and) conforms to what he knows to be wrong'. The two clauses here are so nearly the same in substance, that the conjunction might be dispensed with.

OR. This is the only conjunction comparable to the preposition 'of', in respect of vagueness and ambiguity.

In the first place, this conjunction is very frequently employed where 'and' would be more suitable; the alternative being only a mere semblance. Examples are given in the Grammar (p. 176). In the next place, the alternative is so often confined to a choice between two names, that the conjunction is rendered too weak for alternative facts or assertions of great importance. The instances will exemplify both points.

'All that part of our happiness arising from our hopes *or* our fears depends on imagination'. The proper conjunction is 'and'.

To point out a synonymous, or explanatory alternative, the more explicit phrases are—'in other words', 'that is to say', 'that is'. 'He was called an empiric, *that is*, a quack'.

'In some legends of saints; we find that they were born with a lambent circle *or* golden aureola about their heads'. This is the trivial use of 'or', to designate two alternative modes of describing the same appearance. We might here drop the conjunction, on the same principle as the omission of 'and'—a 'lambent circle, a golden aureola'; but the use of 'or' is fully justified by custom.

'This angelic coronet shed light alike upon the chambers of a cottage *or* a palace, upon the gloomy limits of a cottage *or* the vast expansion of a cathedral'. In this sentence the reasons in favour of 'and' are decided; indeed, 'or' has but little to say for itself. The usual construction with 'alike' is 'and': 'rich and poor alike'. The fact stated in the sentence is laid down with broad generality, as to saints at large, and not with reference to a single saint,

whose birthplace must needs be one, either the cottage or the palace.

In a sentence already quoted (p. 143) there occurs the phrase—'there is scarce a poet *or* historian among the Roman authors'. The weakening effect of the use of 'or' for synonymous phrases is felt here. But for our knowledge of the meanings, we might easily suppose that 'poet' and 'historian' were two names for the same person or class. To bring out the alternation of meaning or subject, we must say—'scarcely *either* a poet *or* a historian'; 'scarcely a Roman author, *either* poet *or* historian'. Or put in a positive form—'nearly all the Roman authors, poets and historians alike'.

'They who (that) have no real feeling always pitch their expressions too high *or* too low'. The 'or' is inadequate to the occasion. There is an alternative contrast amounting to opposition. Say '*either* too high, *or else* too low'. More decided thus: 'They that want real feeling never pitch their expressions at the right point; they are either too high, or else too low'.

'The thing was done by force *or* fraud'. If 'force' and 'fraud' are to be marked out as two distinct facts, one of them (and not the other) being the instrument assigned, we should at least repeat the preposition—'by force *or by* fraud'; the alternative being further improvable, as in the other instances, by 'else'.

'Notwithstanding all the attempts (which) 'that' have been made to explain this away *(or)* 'and' even to turn it to the poet's credit, it is surely a great defect in him.' The author here evidently thinks that 'or' followed by 'even' has an emphatic or intensifying effect. If he intends to rise strongly in pitch, he could also say—'to explain this away, *nay more*, to turn it to the poet's credit —'.

'Perhaps he (Marlborough) could not have been the great man he was, had he had a heart either for love or hatred, or pity or fear, or regret or remorse'. Might be—'a heart for love or for hatred, for pity or for fear, for regret or for remorse'. Hypercritically viewed, the two last couples are

not really contrasts like the first, and the coupling in their case might be abandoned—'for love or for hatred, for pity, for fear, for regret, for remorse'. Again, as 'regret' and 'remorse' are nearly synonymous, there is room for the synonymous 'or', without the emphatic preposition: 'for regret *or* remorse'.

'Or', 'nor', 'neither', 'either', although originally dual words are freely extended to three or more alternatives. 'Logic *neither* observes, *nor* invents, nor *discovers*, but proves', for 'Logic does not observe, it does not invent, it does not discover, it proves'. The following may be regarded as an elegant way of managing a triple alternative:—

> 'For surer sign had followed, *either* hand,
> *Or* voice, *or else* a motion of the mere'.
>
> *Morte d' Arthur.*

For negation, the corresponding form would be 'nor yet': 'The Rector was *neither* laborious, *nor* obviously self-denying, *nor yet* very copious in almsgiving'.

The following is a gratuitous licence: 'Of the four elements, *neither* is self-mixed'. Say 'no one'.

BUT. The chief error with 'but' is to use it where 'and' is enough; an error springing from the tendency to use strong words without sufficient occasion.

'One cannot say he wanted wit, *but* rather that he was frugal of it.' Here 'but' is not the aptest word. It would be in keeping in such a sentence as the following: 'He had wit in abundance, *but* he was frugal of it'. The 'but' is an arrest upon a natural inference from the first clause; if he had wit in abundance, he would (we should suppose) use it freely. 'We cannot say he wanted wit, we can say only that he was frugal of it'; 'he did not want wit, he was only frugal of it'.

'But' is somewhat too strong for this instance: 'Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; *but* the greatest of these is charity'.

In my opinion, the Revising Committees of our transla-

tion of the Bible would do well to disuse 'but' in the sententious contrasts or obverse couples scattered everywhere in the Old and New Testaments, and more especially frequent in the Book of Proverbs. The 10th chapter of Proverbs is almost wholly made up of these obverse couples; and there are only three exceptions to the use of 'but'—verses 15, 16, 20; although it is just as much required for these as for the rest. Either 'while' might be used, or, as in these three verses, nothing at all. The phrase 'on the other hand' is a good equivalent, but too long for the sententious structure.

In the following verses, Romans iv. 4, 5, 'while' is a remedy for the collision of 'buts': 'Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace *but* of debt: (*but*) 'while' to him that worketh not *but* believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly —'.

'No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, *but* grievous'. (Hebrews xii. 2.) 'No chastening for the present seemeth joyous; *on the contrary* it is grievous'. Otherwise, 'chastisement at the time is not joyous; on the contrary, it is grievous'.

'Though admiration is excited by abstruse researches, yet pleasure is not given, nor affection conciliated *but* by softer accomplishments'. Although 'but' is abundantly employed in this situation, the meaning is more precisely hit by 'except' or (turning the sentence) by 'only'.

In the construction 'not—but', the 'but' is taken away from its proper employment to constitute a pause before a transition. Instead of saying 'not that, *but* this', it would be enough to say 'not that, this' could we only pause after uttering 'that', to shew that the negative has been stated, and that the positive is now to be given. When the order is changed, 'but' is not wanted. 'Give me that, not this'. Also when we repeat the verb: 'I don't want that, I want' this', 'don't give me that, give me this'. A good speaker could give with his voice the transition—'Not the Jews only,—the whole of the ancient world, practised the rites of sacrifice'. In print, however, our chief device is the use of

'but', which, although drawn from its strict signification, is consecrated to the purpose.

IF. This short emphatic word is greatly overdone.

When an action hangs upon some condition, the conditional clause is introduced by 'if'. 'I will go to the meeting, *if* I be disengaged'. There is an action pending; some other action or fact is needed before it can take place.

The laws of nature contain an expression for two things that hang together, so that when the one happens, the other happens also. 'Stones sink in water'; 'wood floats'. Throw a stone into a pool, and it will sink to the bottom; throw in a piece of wood, and it will float. We are not guilty of positive error in expressing any such law with an 'if': 'if stones are let fall into water they will sink to the bottom'. The impropriety lies in intruding the conjunction into a case sufficiently provided for by a simpler expression—'stones sink in water', 'wood floats'. Instead of the short expression 'gold is heavy', I might use the pompous circumlocution, '*If* you take a piece of gold, and weigh it bulk for bulk against other materials, you will find it heavy'.

'*If* you will come, *I shall be delighted*', would be more elegant—'your coming will delight me'. '*If* it would rain, we should get much good'; 'rain would do much good'.

'*If* I would compare Jonson with Shakespeare, I must acknowledge him the correcter poet'. 'Comparing him with Shakespeare, I must acknowledge—'.

According as an action becomes in its import grave, is there propriety in stating the condition with emphasis—'*If* he is guilty, his punishment will be severe'. To say—'his guilt will be followed by a severe punishment', is feeble and inadequate.

'If' used for 'in order that'. 'From the speech of the Home Secretary, it will be seen that a strong expression of public opinion is required *if* the Bill is to be passed into a Law'.

INFLECTION.

THE GENDER OF NOUNS.

EXCEPT for employing correctly the various names distinctive of the masculine and feminine genders, there is little in this department of grammar to occupy the pupils. One of the merits of our language consists in not imposing gender upon inanimate things.

It is noticed in the Grammar that, while we have names for the masculine and the feminine gender, we have in many cases also a name for both indifferently; as 'child', which applies alike to a boy and to a girl. So we have the names 'person', 'human being', for both sexes. In like manner, there are numerous designations of trades, offices, or occupations, without distinction of sex: shop-keeper, grocer, stationer, inn-keeper, citizen, elector, voter, teacher, agent, speaker, neighbour, rival—apply alike to men and to women. The names for classes formed on moral or mental qualities are usually common: saint, sinner, believer, Christian, worshipper, friend, enemy, genius, fool, bigot, thief, culprit, schemer, flatterer, outcast, slanderer, backbiter—are used for both sexes.

The reason is obvious. These occupations and characters do not depend upon sex; consequently, the sex is not stated. The principle is sound and intelligible, and is our guide in settling doubtful or distracting usages.

The cases for the employment of distinct names for gender are these:—

1. To state the functions where each sex has a character-

istic and incommunicable part: as 'husband', 'wife'; 'father', 'mother'. This is the fundamental relation, and whatever refers to it must observe a distinction of sexes. We use 'son' and 'daughter', 'brother' and 'sister', to indicate which of the children of a family can be husbands and fathers, and which wives and mothers. The same applies to the lower animals. This is natural gender in the highest degree.

2. There are certain offices, usually filled by men, that confer rank and honour, so that their titles or designations are honourable. Now, in the system of ranks, the wife shares the honours of the husband; the wife of a sovereign may be unable to exercise any power belonging to her husband, but she has dignity that gives her precedence of all her husband's subjects; whereupon a title is created for her to signify this elevation. If the husband is 'king', the wife is 'queen'; if he is 'emperor' she is 'empress'. And so for the different grades of nobility: 'duke', 'duchess'; 'baron', 'baroness'.

3. In a few cases, a feminine termination is given to express a woman holding an occupation or character that may be held by either sex, being independent of sex. Such are—author, authoress; testator, testatrix; executor, executrix; heir, heiress; patron, patroness; prophet, prophetess; priest priestess; shepherd, shepherdess; editor, editress; giant, giantess.

'Priestess' is not the wife of a priest; nor 'prophetess' the wife of a prophet; they exercise the vocations in their own person; they may be unmarried, or they may be the wives of men that are neither priest nor prophet.

This last necessity comes into conflict with the preceding, and may lead to ambiguity. Thus we may have a Queen in her own right, who may be a single woman. Such was Queen Elizabeth. So with a Peeress. In the case of 'master' and 'mistress', both meanings may concur; the mistress has her title partly as wife of the master, and partly as joint head and manager of the household. Being head of a house or establishment will alone obtain the title.

It would be well to disuse the feminine termination for all offices or occupations that do not involve the distinction of sex, and for all occasions when sex is immaterial. Thus —authoress, poetess, executrix, testatrix, administratrix, seem quite unnecessary. Hume says—'Henry VII.'s mother was sole daughter and *heir* [sex not in question] of the Duke of Somerset'. Motley mentions 'the *Archdukes* Albert and *Isabella*' (Barneveld, I.. p. 211): position, and not sex, is referred to. Some difficulty might be felt with those names that are made up of 'master' and 'mistress'; as 'schoolmaster', 'postmaster'. There is a reason for 'schoolmistress', because in schools there is a division of labour, and certain parts of the teaching are considered as more suitable to the female teacher. There is less necessity for 'postmistress'; seeing that the duties are identical, whoever perform them. We should have something to get over in using the word 'master' to a woman in any form; yet, it seems barely tolerable to adapt to the feminine form the metaphor, '*master* of the situation'—'*master* of herself'. Still instances occur: 'Such dangers pretty women gladly run into, especially when, like Charlotte von Stein, they are perfect *mistresses* of *themselves*'. (G. H. Lewes, *Life of Goethe.*)

'Actress' is justified by the habit of making women perform women's parts. But for this, it would be as needless as 'authoress'.

We have not as yet a form suited to addressing a woman in the chair at a meeting. Our forms 'Mr. Chairman', 'Mr. President', 'Sir', are adapted to men. As the word 'men' is representative of both sexes, when sex is not in the question, so ought the word 'chairman'. Whether we can reconcile ourselves to '*Mr.* Chairman' for women as well as for men, is yet in the future.

Formerly there existed both 'doctoress' and 'doctress'. Now, when women are beginning to aspire to the full status of the medical profession, we do not revive these feminine forms; we extend the masculine title to the other sex, making it a word of no gender.

'Servant applies to both sexes. The designating of the

separate sexes—'*man*-servant', '*maid*-servant'—is partly owing to their being employed for different uses, and partly because, when the two are mixed in the same household, their apartments must be kept distinct.

'Waiter' is now common to men and women.

'Laundress' is a feminine name, because washing has been always done by women. The great laundry establishments that have sprung up in populous places are often in charge of men; so that we ought to have 'laundryman', as well as dairyman',* applicable to both sexes.

In a choir, there is a real and permanent distinction in the male and the female parts; yet the feminine 'songstress' has gone out of use, and has to be replaced by 'female voice' or 'female singer'. A similar distinction of sex enters into ballet dancing. The French have the feminine form 'danseuse'; we have no feminine.

The old designations for many trades are originally feminine words, as webster, bakester, kempster, sewster, huckster, maltster. These trades are now common to the two sexes: indeed, some of them are male avocations almost exclusively. The consequence is that the termination 'ster', not being applied to new cases, has lost its power. The ending 'ess' alone suggests the female sex; and with it there is no mistake. We could not make common a feminine in 'ess', if we wished it; 'laundress' would not find its way as the name of a man.

NUMBER OF NOUNS.

When one thing is mentioned, the singular noun expresses the fact; when more than one, with uncertainty as to how many, the plural is used. To signify a definite number, we need the numeral adjectives.

Our language is happy in having (with a few exceptions)

* Mätzner mentions a feminine 'launder' '(Old English 'lavender', in Palsgrave 'laundre', French 'lavendiere')', by the side of which sprang up 'laundress', which again gave rise to the masculine 'launderer'.

thrown off distinctions of gender where they are uncalled for; as the fictitious personifying of inanimate things, and the mention of the gender of classes of human beings wherein both sexes enter alike. But as regards number, we are not so fortunate. We are not at liberty to mention any subject without first ascertaining whether that subject be one or more than one, so that we may use the suitable form of the noun; we must say either 'a house' or 'houses', although we may not know which is the fact, and although the number be altogether unimportant. As there is a common gender, so there ought to have been a common or neutral number.

It is curious to note the devices for evading the expression of number. As the abstract noun has not a plural, we may say also that it has not a singular, for singular and plural are correlated; hence by means of it we can avoid committing ourselves to number; wishing to avoid both the singular 'a house', and the plural 'houses', and yet to mention the subject, we say 'house property', which commits us to nothing. Again, if we wish to give the idea of 'fine', without saying either 'a fine' or 'fines', which obliges us to make a choice, we say 'fining', which is the infinitive of the verb, and does not possess number. The verbal abstract nouns have the same effect; 'conversation' does not specify either one act or several acts.

It is a merit of language never to introduce any circumstance, however small, that is not required for the purpose in hand. Brevity, or saving of words, is not the only thing thereby gained. The reader at first supposes that every circumstance has a bearing upon the sense intended; and he is dissatisfied with himself if he do not discover such bearing; he is consoled only by past experience, which tells that by the usages of the language expressions are often brought in to lie idle. When 'a man' is mentioned, there ought, in strictness, to be a specific reason for confining the subject of discourse to one man, and for excluding two or more men; yet, in many instances, there is no contrast or pointed exclusion of plurality. What is put forward may

be equally true whether we say 'a man' or 'men'; nevertheless, we must make our choice, although in so doing, we say, by implication, something that we do not mean. On special occasions, we get out of the difficulty by a circumlocution to the effect that what we say is equally true of 'a man' and of 'men'. For this particular instance we have the convenient abstract words—'mankind', 'humanity'.

'He can make *a pair* of shoes', if rigidly interpreted, would mean—he cannot make, or I am not able, or do not choose, to affirm that he can make, *more* than one pair. 'He can make you several pairs of shoes' is equally exclusive, by implication, of his making one pair. If the two expressions are not mutually exclusive, the strict way of stating the case is—'he can make you one pair, or more than one'. We get out of the difficulty through our own private knowledge; we are aware that we often use a plural when we do not mean to exclude the singular, and interpret plurals accordingly. The neutral form for the particular case is—'he is a shoemaker'.

It is thought necessary in law to say 'any person or persons', when the rule equally applies to one and to more than one. This supposed necessity assumes that 'a person' excludes 'persons', and that 'persons' excludes 'a person' It shows the defect of our language in not having a noun form that applies equally to both numbers, in the same way as the word 'person' applies to both genders, and supersedes the still farther alternation, 'men or women'; but for which, the expression would have to run—'any man or woman, or any men or women, or any man along with any woman or women, or any woman along with any man or men'.

In the laws of nature, the expression of number is irrelevant: 'a stone falls' and 'stones fall' are equally suitable and equally unsuitable. That it is one stone or many stones is no part of the case; neither singularity nor plurality is a condition of the falling; and, hence, there should be a way of stating the fact that omits both.

The plural is not always an idle form. When we say—

'to ascend Mont Blanc, you must have *guides*', we both say and mean that *a guide* will not do. In the same way, if we had said *a guide*, we should have been supposed to imply that one guide is enough. In these circumstances, the variation of numbers is significant; they mean what they say. A common number would not convey the sense without an additional qualifying word, 'one' or 'several', as the case might be.

As with our class nouns we must say either '*a* stone' or 'stones', and do not assign any place or purpose to the naked noun 'stone', it might seem strange that this form has never been adopted as the neutral or common number of the noun. Some approach to the usage is made in the use of the term 'man'—'man is mortal', which fully and equally applies to men singly or in numbers. This, however, is accounted a sort of licence or figure; the lawyers would not be satisfied to put 'man' instead of 'any person or persons'. Could we express the law of gravity—'stone fall', we should also say, in a general prohibition, 'person shall not'.

If we had no plural inflection, and no usage to mark the singular (as by the article, *a* person), a noun standing without any qualification would mean that number is not considered; that one and more than one are equally understood. In case of stating one to the exclusion of a greater number, or of stating a number to the exclusion of one, we should need a qualifying adjective: one, ten, some, many, most, all. We should then have the advantage of being definite when we wished it; yet we should not be compelled to be definite, since we have adjectives that have a very wide and vague scope; for example, 'some', 'certain', which commit us to very little.

It is always instructive to look at the forms of language as they are used in science; we shall there see them in their utmost precision; although, perhaps, they may be wanting in rhetorical energy. Now, in science, the plural noun is employed in all universal statements, and in all statements short of universal but exceeding one: 'all bodies gravi-

tate', 'all birds are egg-laying', 'some metals do not corrode'. There is this peculiarity, however, that, in science, the plural always includes the singular: 'the cross of St. Paul's gravitates', 'there is one metal that does not corrode'.

Plurality in the scientific form,—and not in that only, but in the looser ways of speaking (with some important exceptions)—means that each individual may be taken separately, the assertion being true of each. 'Stones fall' means—take any stone you please, and, on the withdrawal of the support, it will fall. In fact, the plural is a short way of saying what it would want a great many statements to overtake: 'stars shine by their own light' is a condensation of hundreds of thousands of declarations, with each star in the heavens as subject, and 'shines by its own light' as predicate. The plural number of the verb lends itself to the same meaning.

This brings us, by contrast, to the Collective Noun, where there is plurality, and also unity. The collective noun is a singular noun, but means a group or aggregate organised for some common action. Happily, we are provided with names for the most important collective meanings: family, race, community, society, state, sect, herd, flock, group, cattle, people, army, infantry, crockery, crowd, mob, crew, crop, property, congregation, garrison, and so on. But, occasionally, from want of a collective noun, we use a plural, which, while indicating that there are several things implied (more than one at least) indicates also that these things do not act separately and independently, although the manner of their acting may be the same. Thus, the plurals—troops, battalions, masses, legions, arms, grounds, premises, cards, damages, bowels, intestines, brains, authorities, guards, fencibles, musketry, wages, fittings—express that there are more than one of the things named; but, in addition to this, we understand by the names that they are combined and work together, and not by separate or independent action.

The effect of collectiveness is seen in many other plurals,

as acres, gardens, policies, woods, services, respects, parts, spirits, offices, trappings, shutters, blinds, manners, clothes, words, accents, tones, cries, tidings, news, plans, stairs, drawers, lodgings, statistics, annals, memoirs, papers, buildings, arrears, dues, proceeds, customs, taxes, stocks, estates, summers, days, snows, dews, winds, rains, waters, sands, forces (army and navy), hostilities, dangers, eatables, drinkables, viands, greens, nerves, veins, slumbers, goods, effects, sweepings, ruins, remains, environs, festivities, nuptials, orgies, obsequies. All these words are employed on occasions when we could not resolve the plurality into a series of distinct and separate individualities.

Corporate bodies are often named by the plural for the individual members: the fishmongers, goldsmiths, stationers. So—peers, commoners, working-men, ministers, judges.

A large class of improper or exceptional plurals is made up of names of things that are *pairs*: scissors, snuffers, tongs, pincers, compasses, bellows, scales, spectacles, reins, nippers, pliers, trousers, leggings, braces, breeches, moustaches, whiskers.

It is well to use the word 'pair' along with these plural names, and thus give them their true singular character and construction: a pair of scissors, a pair of compasses, a pair of spectacles.

In the names of materials, there is an abuse of the plural number, arising from the circumstance that certain kinds of material, as sand, coal, peat, embers, cinders, filings, oats, cheese, bread (loaves), bricks, rags, ashes—are made up of detached pieces or parts heaped together. The separation is in most instances a pure accident and does not affect our mode of estimating the material, which is by bulk or weight. Still, we are accustomed to the plurals—sands, coals, peats, potatoes, apples, strawberries, eggs; and if they are the subject of a sentence, we have to make the verb in the plural: the sands *are* run; strawberries *are* dear; eggs *are* scarce.

'As in the summer time the thirsty *sands*
Drink the swift *waters* of the Manzanares.'
(Longfellow.)

'No more the cabin *smokes* rose wreathed and blue.'

(Bryant.)

'Come when the *rains* have glazed the snow.'

Now, although apples, strawberries, and eggs are produced in separate individual masses, and have even form, symmetry, and character, yet we are not concerned with them otherwise than as making up a certain mass of nutritive material; it would be all one, if they were coherent masses like clay in a brick field.

It is an elegance to keep these plurals from being prominent. They are still farther removed from the typical use of the plural number,—the condensation of separate statements, each of independent value and standing. We seldom want to express any attribute of a single grain of sand, a single piece of coal, a single brick, a single strawberry; when these exceptional occasions arise, we do well to give them all the honours of plural construction. Notwithstanding that coal is broken into lumps for use, correct speakers (as formerly remarked) prefer the singular form, in speaking of it; 'coal has risen in price', 'put some coal on the fire'. So also firewood has to be broken up into chips, and therefore appears as detached individual bodies. In England, the custom is still to use the singular name 'wood', with adjectives of quantity in bulk, 'some wood'; the Scotch are fond of obtruding the plurality—sticks.

CASE.

Case in our language is substantially confined to the Possessive inflection of Nouns and Pronouns.

The fact that the possessive form is used chiefly for persons and personifications, and that, even for these, it is only one of several forms capable of giving expression to the meaning, still farther limits its value.*

* Very few grammarians have adverted to this limitation. The following extract from a letter of Coleridge (quoted by Mr. Earle) shows how strongly he felt it. 'I have read two pages of *Lalla Rookh*, or whatever it is called.

The Possessive case is really another part of Speech. It does not represent the Noun in its strict use, as the subject or object of a sentence; it is purely a qualifying word, and makes the nearest approach to the Adjective,* although we may also view it as having passed through the stage of the Adverb. The Dative and the Ablative cases in Latin are of the nature of adverbs, except when, from some special reason, the verb governs them.

It is important to trace the gradations of meaning of the possessive. If we suppose it to start from its most familiar and best understood meaning—personal property or belongings—it stretches away considerably but of this limit. Let us view the successive aspects of possession.

1. Possession in the strictest sense applies to a man's property, belongings, or effects, the things external to him that he can call his—money, land, houses, goods, chattels, clothes, furniture; every kind of property in things, having a marketable value. 'John's house', 'the farmer's crops', 'his watch', 'her canary', 'their ships', are all property in the strictest sense of the word, and are accurately expressed by the possessive case.

2. In the relations of family life, each is allowed to claim all the others as possessions: 'Peter's wife', 'Mary's husband', 'our father', 'my brother', 'her uncle', 'their cousins'.

Also in the relations of master and servant, there is mutual possession so far as concerns the use of the possessive case

Merciful Heaven! I dare no more, that I may be able to answer at once to any questions, "I have but looked at the work." Oh, Robinson! if I could, or if I dared, act and feel as Moore and his set do, what havoc could I not make amongst their crockery-ware! Why, there are not three lines together without some adulteration of common English, and the ever-recurring blunder of using the possessive case, "*compassion's* tears," &c. for the preposition "of"—a blunder of which I have found no instances earlier than Dryden's slovenly verses written for the trade. The rule is, that the case's is always *personal*; either it marks a person, or a personification, or the relique of some proverbial personification, as "Who for their belly's sake," in *Lycidas*.'—*Crabb Robinson's Diary*, 1817.

* The possessive is called an Adjective by Wallis. His reasons are curious: they are given in Sir John Stoddart's work already quoted.

and possessive adjectives: 'the Queen's ladies of the bedchamber', 'John's master', 'my clerks', 'our foreman'.

In all other social relationships—civil ruler, head of a society, teacher, fellow-citizen, member of parliament, provost, mayor, clergyman, sheriff, party, church—each expresses a certain possession in the others by the possessive case. We can say—'our policeman', 'our parochial board', 'our minister'.

The people we trade with, or employ professionally, are—*our* baker, butcher, grocer, doctor, lawyer; and these in their turn say—*my* customers, patients, clients.

3. We claim as ours, and state by means of the possessive words, our own body, in all its parts: *his* head, foot, chest, nerves, blood, stomach, mouth, arm, hair, bones.

Also the merits and demerits, healthy and diseased functions of the different organs: John's activity, vigour, digestion, gout, illness, infirmities, blindness, lameness, deafness, laziness.

From the body, we pass to the mind, and regard it as individual property, both collectively and in its several functions: Newton's genius, intellect, mathematical power; Milton's sense of melody, his sublimity, zeal, fortitude; Cæsar's magnanimity, military skill, bravery, statesmanship, judgment, tact; Columbus's daring, perseverance, foresight, resolution; Solomon's wisdom.

We may, in the same way, claim our acquisitions, knowledge, or learning, and designate them by the possessive; Bentley's scholarship, Macaulay's reading.

4. Hitherto we have supposed what may be allowed, without violence of language, to be our possessions, or belongings, something personal to ourselves. When we pass, however, from bodily and mental parts and acquirements to reputation or estimate in the view of other people, we are no longer proprietors, but tenants at will; we may still speak of this as ours, but not with the same rigour as when we designate our property, relationships, and personal endowments. We are passive in the hands of others; and the best way of stating the fact is an active verb: instead of

'Aristotle's fame', we should say, in full, 'Aristotle has been famous, or renowned'. The possessive form is one of those curt and elliptical expressions that we find useful; but it is not the most adequate or suitable mode of expressing the fact. What is meant is a series of actions on the part of other men; and the natural and full representation consists in putting these parties forward as agents or subjects of an active verb, of which Aristotle is object; or else making him the subject of a passive verb, completed by the proper agency. 'All civilised nations have admired Aristotle'; 'he has been admired by all his successors in philosophy'.

5. There is only one step further to the extreme point of deviation from personal belongings; indeed the case just quoted already makes the step. It is to use the possessive for events or incidents that we merely take part in: as birth, life, death, burial, succession, elevation, capture. A man's hat or dog may be called his property; but to give him 'birth' and 'death' as property, is to stretch the meaning of possession very far indeed. In such cases, there is an employment of the verbal noun for the verb, to contract the expression: 'on his death' is for 'when he died'; 'George's succession' is the verbal abstract for 'he succeeded'; 'his attempt failed', 'he attempted, and failed'; 'his coming was unexpected', 'we did not expect him to come'; 'after his capture', 'after he was taken'.

When there is no purpose to be served, the verb form should, in such cases, be adhered to, as the regular and appropriate construction. An event is always best expressed by a verb; in complicated statements, we attain shortness by the verbal noun, but when nothing is gained, we should adhere to the primary form. 'A committee was appointed to consider the code with a view to *its amendment* (*amending it*)'.

'Though great and splendid actions must from (*their* nature) 'the nature *of them*' be reserved for eminent occasions; yet a system is defective that leaves no room (for *their* production) 'to produce *them*'. They are important both from (their) immediate advantage, and from (their) re-

moter influence. (*Their* commemoration) 'To commemorate *them*' by the pens of historians and poets (awakens) 'is to awaken' in distant bosoms the sparks of kindred excellence.'

'*Its* value consists', 'the value *of it* consists'. 'Whatever name we give to the absolute case, (*its* form) 'the form *of it*' is the same as the nominative'. Or, 'in form, it agrees with the nominative'.

'No sooner was the town threatened than the king hastened to *its* rescue': 'to the rescue *of it*', or 'to rescue *it*', or simply 'to the rescue'.

The extreme range of the possessive gives rise to ambiguity. '*His* bust' may mean, first, a bust *in his property* or *possession*, the primitive meaning of possession; second, a bust *of him*; third, a bust of some one else *executed by him*. 'His books' means either his library, or the books composed by him. In this sense we speak of 'John's Gospel', which is felt to be a contracted expression for the gospel composed by John.

'The mariners' compass' is a condensed expression for the compass used by mariners to steer by. It is a great liberty taken with the possessive inflection.

For many of these remote extensions of the possessive, the preposition 'of' is better. 'On her own account', 'on account of herself'. 'Owen's praise' means, in the first instance, the praise bestowed by Owen on some other person, for the other meaning, we say 'the praise of Owen'.

'Then shall man's pride and dulness comprehend
His actions', passions', being's, use and end'.

In the first line, the possessive is legitimate; a man's mental qualities are allowed to come within the compass of his belongings. The second line indulges in two kinds of licence: the nouns are not personal; while 'use and end' cannot be admitted as property.

The first question of the Shorter Catechism exemplifies the ambiguities of these possessive constructions. 'What is the chief end *of man?*' leaves it uncertain whether the compilers meant the end that man proposes to himself, or the end that

some other being proposes with reference to him; the last view being perhaps the most suitable to the construction with 'of'. Unfortunately, however, the answer, instead of repeating the same form, gives the possessive case:—'*Man's* chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him for ever'. This would seem to decide for the first view—the end proposed by man for himself; of the two constructions 'his love', 'the love of him', the first means that he loves some one, the second, that some one loves him. Yet we have reason to think from the tenor of the Catechism that man is the passive and not the active subject under 'end'. If this be so, the question might run thus:—'What end did God chiefly propose to himself in creating man? The end chiefly proposed by God in creating man, was that man should glorify God and enjoy him for ever'.

The possessive case of the relative 'whose' is subject to similar considerations, with this difference, that 'whose' is applied to things as well as to persons. This gives it a much wider application; it includes 'his, her(s), their(s), its'. It is not limited, therefore, to such attributes as may legitimately belong to persons. 'The moon, *whose* orb', is the same as 'its' orb.

As 'its' is often conveniently changed into 'of it', so 'whose' may be changed into 'of whom', 'of which', 'and of him', 'and of it'. 'The king made an image of gold, (*whose* height) the height *of which*', '*and* the height *of it*', was three score cubits'.

CONJUGATION OF THE VERB.

The main and characteristic use of the Verb is to express *action*, which it does by affirmation or denial: 'Romulus founded (or did not found) Rome'. It is often necessary to specify circumstances that accompany an action, such as time, place, or manner. The Adverb is contrived to supply this want; and a scheme of Adverbs might be given suf-

ficient for every variety of circumstances. But there grew up in the early languages (with some exceptions) the method of compounding the root verb with particles for expressing some of the more permanent circumstances, such as *time*. What are called the TENSES of the verb are the changes made upon the root to express some leading variety of Time; the distinction between Present and Past being marked by inflections in all the languages of our family; while in many languages, futurity is also expressed by modifications or additions to the root verb—'come', 'came'; *amo* (present), *amavi* (past), *amabo* (future).

As an incident of Time, or a variety of action closely connected with it, expression is given in the inflected languages to the difference between unfinished or imperfect action and finished or completed action: *scribo*, I am now going on writing; *scribebam*, I was going on writing; *scripsi*, I completed certain writing in some past time. There is a neat brevity in stating this circumstance by inflection, as in Latin and in Greek, when we consider the number of words that are needed to give the same thing in English: *scripseram*, 'I had been going on writing'—'I had completed the act of writing'.

It is quite necessary to have some means of giving the time of an action, as well as the complete or incomplete performance; but it is not necessary that this should be done by inflections. The most elaborate scheme of inflections still leaves something unexpressed, so that we are driven at last upon the device of using additional words, either adverbs or what are called auxiliary verbs.

Some circumstances in the MANNER of an action have also been embodied in the changes made in the root verb. For example, when an action is stated not absolutely, but conditionally, the verb is differently modified, and a series of tenses is formed, for present, past, future, complete and incomplete, of the conditional verb. This is the subjunctive MOOD, which exists in full force in the old languages, but is a mere remnant in ours. The machinery is too great for the occasion; we find that conditionality can be given by a con-

junction—'if' or 'though'—and need not be repeated in the verb.

These two facts—Time and Conditionality—must be expressed somehow. The other varieties of the verb, namely, Voice, Person, Number, are quite superfluous; they express nothing that is not already provided for; they are more or less convenient, but in no wise necessary.

The change of the verb for VOICE consists in the invention of a Passive variation of the verb, for stating the same action in a different form: 'lightning struck the spire', 'the spire was struck by lightning', are not two facts, but the same fact, with mere reversal of the order of subject and object. To repeat all the tenses and moods of the verb, under a different termination, merely to exhibit a difference such as this, seems a great waste of power. It is all the more gratuitous in the classical languages, where the subject may be placed first even with the active verb. We may say *mundum creavit Deus*, which is in every respect the same as *mundus creatus est a Deo;* the benefit of bringing forward the object to the beginning of the sentence is gained without a duplicate scheme of moods and tenses for the passive voice.

Our language does not permit, as a rule, this inversion of order, and we must seek it in some other way; and the way adopted is to manufacture a passive voice by help of auxiliaries. To express the fact of creation, putting the object first, we have no choice but—'the world was created by God'.

The conveniences of the passive voice are these. In the first place, an action may have occurred, and the agent be unknown. We cannot accommodate the active voice to this situation, except by our indefinite pronouns; we cannot say '—— created the world', we may say 'some one' did it. Our old pronoun, 'man', might have done for us the same service as 'man' in German or 'on' in French. What we do is to surmount the difficulty at the expense of a passive scheme of the verb: 'the world was created'. While we can omit from the passive construction the expressing of the agent, 'by him', we cannot leave a verb without a subject.

In Latin, the subject of the verb is often suppressed, but is yet assumed to be known; we could not write 'creavit mundum', unless we understood who was the subject of 'creavit'.

Again, in many cases, the importance of an action is entirely confined to the effect; the cause or agent is of no practical consideration. 'London is built on the Thames' is a great fact, whoever the agent or agents may have been. Even if we knew the founders of London, we should seldom think proper to mention them.

When an event is reported, the reporter is of very secondary consideration; the event itself is what engages our attention. When some conspicuous person dies, we hear it said that his death 'is announced'.

In a complex sentence the same person or thing is sometimes subject in one of the clauses, and object in another. Clumsiness is avoided by our being able to vary the forms of the verb so as to dispense with a plurality of subjects. 'A physician *was consulted*, and *gave* his opinion' compares favourably with '——— *consulted* a physician, and the physician (or who) *gave* his opinion'. 'The Atlantic, *blown* over for hours by the hurricane *rose*, in mountains'; for 'the hurricane blew over the Atlantic, and the Atlantic (or which) rose in mountains'.

As a mere alternative form, the passive voice gives variety. It also enables, on occasion, the object to be brought into a leading place. In enumerating the functions of Deity, we say, *inter alia*, '*God* created the world'; in making the world a subject, we say '*The world* was created by God'.

The inflexion for PERSON, so fully worked out in the classical languages, and almost wholly omitted from ours, is a harmonic or echoing form; it repeats in the verb what is already stated in the subject. When any one uses the pronoun 'I', he makes known that he is the speaker; there is no necessity for stating the fact again in the verb by an ending confined to the first person—'I *am*'. So 'thou' is quite enough to point out who we are addressing, without the special verb form 'art'. These harmonic or sympa-

thising inflections are carried to a prodigious length in the classical languages; the adjective being inflected with the noun, in gender, number, and case; loading the memory with mere incumbrances, which are useful only by chance. On occasions of great emphasis, the iteration of the person in the verb has a certain majesty and force; *ego sum Romanus*, 'I am a Roman man', is very dignified; and the dignity is enhanced by the inflections. The phrase 'I AM' to express the Deity, receives dignity from the support lent to the 'I' by the inflected form 'am'. By our second person singular a similar emphasis is conferred in religious worship.

Respecting Inflection for NUMBER, we may make the same remarks. It is merely a concord; it repeats in the verb what is already given in the noun. It is therefore a superfluity; but may occasionally strengthen the meaning. It is also useful when the noun is unchanged for number; but had the expression of number been left to the noun, there would always have been some way of distinguishing the plural from the singular.

That this inflection is of no great moment is proved by its being absent from our past tense (except in the second person singular), and from both present and past in the auxiliaries —shall, will, may, can, must.

Under the name—MOOD have been included the Imperative form of the verb, the Participle, the Infinitive, and the Gerund.

The Imperative is the form of the verb for giving direction and command, as well as for expressing entreaty or supplication. It is not the form of law or obligation, as the name 'imperative' would imply. We may resolve it into an affirmation: 'it is my wish or desire that you do so and so'. But the situation of directing, commanding, entreating, was likely to have made a form for itself, among the very earliest modifications of the verb.

The Participle, Infinitive, and Gerund, do not contain the main function of the verb—affirmation; yet, as they perform other functions special to the verb, they are still attached to

it, rather than to the other parts of speech that they severally incline to.

It will always be a delicate exercise of grammatical ingenuity to discriminate the Participle, the Infinitive in 'ing', the Gerund in 'ing', and the Verbal Noun in 'ing'. Some additional examples of each are here subjoined. It will be convenient to begin with the Infinitive.

The Infinitive.

The characteristics of the Infinitive, in both its forms, are these:—

1. It cannot affirm or deny.

2. It may take an object, like any other part of the verb: 'to do *nothing*', 'doing *nothing*'.

3. It may take an adverb, like any other part of the verb: '*not* to do anything', 'doing nothing *well*', '*not* to reply would be acting *contemptuously*'.

4. It may be the subject or the object of a sentence, like a Noun: '*to do* nothing is not always pleasant'; 'he dislikes *doing* nothing'.

Very commonly the infinitive gives up its formal place as subject or as object, mostly in favour of a provisional pronoun—*it*, *this*, *that*. The anticipation of the infinitive by means of 'it' is exceedingly frequent. '*It* was not easy *to wound* his feelings'; 'my generous patron had *it* not in his power *to introduce* me personally': '*it*' is the formal subject in the one case, and the formal object in the other, while the infinitives '*to wound*' and '*to introduce*', which are the real subject and object, are formally said to be in apposition to the pronoun. In careful writing, the form in 'to' has a monopoly of this usage.

5 It may take an adjective or a possessive, like a noun. This is the nicest point in connection with the infinitives. A modifying word *along* with an infinitive is properly an adverb, and not an adjective; so far as qualification is concerned, the infinitives retain their verb character: 'we wish to go *soon*'; 'I preferred speaking *last*'.

The adjectives that can be employed are mainly demonstratives (including the definite article); '*that* changing the hour was a mistake'. The demonstrative is really a shortened adverbial phrase, or the equivalent of an adverb: 'changing the hour, *on that occasion, in that way, so,* was a mistake'.

'*The* sending away the messengers led to *the* surrendering the point'. This is a much curtailed form; the article is a remnant of a more circumstantial account; 'the act or circumstance, namely, sending away the messengers led to the act or effect—surrendering the point'.

The possessive coupled with the infinitive is also a condensed form. When, in order to save a clause, a finite verb is thrown into the infinitive, the subject of the verb is transformed into a possessive, thus: 'Luther burnt the Pope's bull, and the Reformation followed'—'*Luther's* burning the Pope's bull brought about the Reformation'. In its new position the subject may be considered as adverbial, just as, in changing from the active to the passive voice, the subject becomes an adverbial phrase of agency (the bull was burnt *by Luther*). 'Much depends on *Richard's* observing the rule, *his* neglecting it will give trouble'. 'Much depends on observing, *by Richard* (or on the part of Richard), the rule; neglecting it, *by him*, will give trouble'. The expanded form is—'Much depends on the fact *that Richard observes* the rule'.

6. The infinitive in 'ing' may have a preposition before it, like the noun. The other infinitive is already made up with the preposition 'to', and cannot easily take a second: but the 'ing' form is adapted to receive prepositions generally. These prepositions are, in many instances, transformed conjunctions: 'before your deciding' is equal to 'before you decide'; 'on his reading the letter', 'when he read the letter'. For 'after they had supped', we may have 'after their supping', 'after supping'.

7. The infinitive in 'to' is not unfrequently used with the force of an adverb. This usage may be compared with the preceding (6). Examples are: 'You wronged yourself

to write in such a case', 'I am glad *to have met* you'. The adverbial meaning may be brought out in other forms; as *by writing, in having written*, I am glad *of having met* you, *from having met* you, *because I have met* you.

Examples of the Infinitive. 'We propose *drawing* a few lessons', or 'we propose *to draw*'.

'*To learn* the art of *being* content is *to realise* a chief condition of our *being* happy'.

'*Being* without work is one thing, *reposing* from work is another thing'.

In these two examples, the action of the verb is stated without a subject; which is the same convenience as we obtain from the passive voice.

'*Easy writing* is *hard reading*'. Here the infinitives are accompanied, each with an adjective of quality; which is decidedly irregular. Either the adjectives should be adverbs, or the infinitives should become nouns in the full sense. The expression is epigrammatic and curt. The full form is—'What is written with ease is read with difficulty'.

'There is *no saying*' is for 'one cannot say'. The adjective 'no' is an adaptation of 'not'.

'He made *a great to do*' is a manifest licence of expression. It is a step farther removed from regularity than the foregoing examples in 'ing'. What may be allowed with the infinitive that is in close assimilation to the noun, is felt in all its incongruity when transferred to the other form.

'*Reading* maketh a full man'. 'To read' could not be used here. The form 'reading' states the persistent habit of reading, which is not given by the infinitive with 'to'. Single and isolated acts, or brief exertions, are better suited by this last form: 'to refuse consent would be unsafe', said of some one occasion.

'The *suffering* Ireland *to send* anything to these colonies, *to bring* anything directly from thence, is itself a favour'. For 'the suffering' we should prefer 'to suffer', or simply 'suffering'. But when one infinitive hangs upon another,

there is a case for restoring the finite verb: 'If we suffer Ireland to send anything ———'.

'*To recover* Silesia, *to humble* the dynasty of Hohenzollern to the dust, was the great object of Maria Theresa's life'.

'*To subsist* in bones, and *be* but pyramidally extant, is a fallacy in duration'. (Sir T. Browne.)

'*To see* with one's own eyes men and countries, is better than *reading* all the books of travel in the world'.

'*It* is much better *to be* a little cautious, than *to run* any risk'.

'What he and they called *levying* war was, in truth, no better than *instigating* murder'.

'A pleasant thing *it* is for the eyes *to behold* the sun'.

'For Miss Richland *to undertake setting* him free, I own, was quite unexpected'.

'I never shall forget the *waking* next morning; the *being* cheerful and fresh for the first moment, and then the *being weighed down* by the stale and dismal oppression of remembrance'. (Dickens.)

'This *fiddling*, *shouting*, *bawling*, I detest'.

'No sighs but of my *breathing*, no tears but of my *shedding*'.

'Harry was charmed *to see* his tutor'.

'Strangers have wept *to hear* his passionate notes'

'The Tuscans raised a joyful cry
To see the red blood flow'.

'I flattered myself with the hopes of his *interesting* himself in favour of the tragedy'.

'I could assure myself of Mr. Vandal's *being* unengaged to any other author'.

'I waited a few days in expectation of its *being put* in rehearsal'.

The Participle.

The Participle is distinguished by these marks:—

1. It cannot of itself affirm or deny; it is no part of the finite verb.

2. It may take an object.

3. It may be qualified by an adverb.

In these three points, it agrees with the Infinitive; in the three following, it differs from the Infinitive.

4. It has a subject.

5. It cannot be qualified by an adjective or a possessive.

6. It tends to become an Adjective, as it drops the peculiarities of the verb.

The value of the Participle as a means of condensation has been shown under the Relative Pronoun and the Adjective. Instead of two clauses, with two finite verbs, one clause and participle will suffice, when there is a common subject: 'having come thus far, I will go on'; 'I have come thus far, and will therefore go on'.

The participial construction has touches of meaning special to itself. The form 'I wrote, *asking*', 'John bear record, *saying*', happily expresses concurrent action; whereas 'I wrote, and asked', implies succession, which may not be meant. So, 'strangers now came from afar, *scenting* the prey'. 'We went on again, *picking* up shells and pebbles'. 'Long after it was dark I sat there, *wondering* whether anybody else would come'. 'I yesterday passed the whole of the afternoon in the churchyard, the cloisters, and the church, *amusing* myself with the tombstones and inscriptions'. (Addison.) The participle in apposition with a noun is sometimes co-ordinating, and sometimes restrictive. After an object, it is usually, but not always, restrictive: 'he postponed all cases *requiring* much preparation' is the equivalent of 'cases that required'. 'As of some one gently *rapping*', 'that was gently rapping'.

When the object is a single person or a single thing, the participle cannot be restrictive. Yet we have such constructions as the following:—'They found *her drawing* water'; 'I saw the *Spirit descending* like a dove'; 'It is with much pleasure that I hear this *great city enquiring* day by day after these my papers'.

Are these appositions co-ordinating? Apparently not. 'I hear this great city, *and it is enquiring*', does not give the

meaning. It is—'I hear the city *in the act of enquiring, as it is enquiring*'; the participle is not the equivalent of an adjective clause, it corresponds rather to an adverbial clause. The form has the advantage, stated above, of fusing the action with the subject of it; it gives a compound or qualified subject, a subject at work in a particular way.

Compare the Latin form 'post Romam conditam', 'after Rome—built', after the fact that Rome had been built; otherwise, 'after the building of Rome'.

'The king's revenues, *economically administered*, were sufficient to meet the ordinary charges of government'. (Macaulay.) 'The king's revenues, *if*, or *when*, or *seeing that they were*, economically administered'. The revenues are not *restricted* in the ordinary sense of adjective restriction; they are conditioned or qualified by the circumstance of being economically administered. 'The *economically administered* king's revenues' would mean the same thing; but we should have to parse 'economically administered', not as an adjective, either restrictive or co-ordinating, but as a participle condensed from an adverbial clause.

'*Mantling* in the goblet see
The pure *beverage* of the bee'.

The beverage *as it mantles*, in the act of mantling, the mantling beverage.

'Nor the pride nor ample pinion
That the Theban *Eagle* bear
Sailing with supreme dominion
Through the azure deep of air.'

The Eagle *as it sails*.

'I heard a voice *speaking* unto me, and *saying* in the Hebrew tongue—' (Acts xxvi. 14) is a literal translation (ἤκουσα φωνὴν λαλοῦσαν πρός με καὶ λέγουσαν κ. τ. λ.).

We have an infinitive form that readily slides into the participial construction: 'in case of *your* being absent'; 'being' is an infinitive qualified by the possessive 'your'; such possessive constructions being frequent, especially with persons. It is the same as 'in case that you are absent':

and follows the law of transformation of a verb into a noun or infinitive, the subject becoming a possessive—'he died', 'his dying, or death'. There is a tendency to pass from this to the form 'in case of *you* being absent', which would have to be construed as a participle. The possessive and infinitive is, in this case, the primitive and regular form; the other is a mere lapse.

So with the following: 'It seems that the catalogue derives its origin from *Hermippus* enumerating the titles of works in the Alexandrine library'. It should be 'Hermippus's enumerating'—'from the fact that Hermippus enumerated'.

The difficulty of adhering to the possessive form occurs when the subject is not a person: 'It does not seem safe to rely on the rule of *demand* creating supply'; in strictness, 'demand's creating supply': the equivalence is 'the rule that demand creates supply', which would be the preferable form.

The following intimation is put up in the Zoological Gardens, London: 'The keepers in this building have strict orders to interfere in every case of the *rule* against smoking *being neglected*'. 'Rule' should be in the possessive, or else the sentence should be recast: 'Strict orders are given to the keepers to interfere whenever any one violates the rule against smoking'.

Lord Brougham copied from Cicero the form—'Mihi sæpenumero cogitanti'—'To *me*, much *reflecting* on these things, it has seemed a worthier honour'. The English idiom for such a situation seems to be exemplified in Addison's Essay on Westminster Abbey: '*When I look* upon the tombs of the great, every emotion of envy dies within me'. The participial form is courted for the advantage of perfectly uniting the act with the person. This is strikingly shown in the following sentence from Cicero:—'*Aranti Quintio Cincinnato nuntiatum est eum dictatorem esse factum*'. We cannot translate literally; we must say, 'as he was ploughing', 'in the act of ploughing', 'at the plough', 'it was announced to *Cincinnatus, as he was ploughing*'. This is not

a case for the infinitive—'it was announced to *Cincinnatus's ploughing*'.

Horace (formally addressing *the Lyre*) says of Orpheus:—

'Cessit immanis tibi blandienti
Janitor aulæ—'

'Cerberus makes way for *you blandishing*'. To say *your* blandishing' would not hit the situation; it is not the blandishing itself, but Orpheus *as he blandished*, that is the prominent subject. 'Cerberus made way for you, while you tickled, or in consequence of your tickling, him'.

Compare—'A petition was presented against *the license being granted*'. Here the emphasis does not lie on license, but on the act—'being granted'; and but for the awkwardness of extending the possessive to impersonal subjects, it would be right to say 'against the *license's* being granted', The straining, however, is superfluous, when we have such easy forms as—'against granting the licence', 'for refusing the licence'.

'He had conducted the hall without any *complaint being urged* against him'. The possessive would be suitable, but undesirable and unnecessary: 'without being complained against by any one', 'without giving rise to any complaint', 'without complaint', 'so that no complaint was urged'.

This construction sometimes occurs even in the subject. 'Even *Egbert being called Bretwalda* was something like *Charles being called Emperor*'. (Freeman.)

The following seems as if it were literally translated from the Latin ablative absolute: 'He is not a man to go through life *with his hands folded*'; 'I then, all smarting with my wounds being cold'. In Latin 'velis passis' may be translated '*with* sails outspread'; but this is not our absolute construction; 'sails outspread', 'hands folded', being enough.

On a monument in Westminster Abbey, to Major-General Stringer Lawrence, occurs 'For discipline *established*, fortresses *protected*, settlements *extended*, French and Indian

armies *defeated*, and peace *concluded*, in the Carnatic'. With this construction, the language should have been Latin.

With a change of order, the disagreeable effect of the construction we have been discussing is done away. Thus—'The difficulty arose from the fact of *there being two Popes* at that time': 'There is a likelihood of *there being ample means* at his command'. Still, a clause would answer as well, if not better: 'from the fact *that there were* then two Popes'.

We may notice one or two varieties of Latin equivalents.

Often a clause is used for our infinitive.

'I am surprised *at your saying so*'—'miror *quod tu ita dicis*': lit. 'because you say so'. (Altered from Massie, Latin Pr. Comp.)

'James seems to have been the elder, from *his being* always mentioned first'—'Jacobus major natu videtur fuisse *ex eo quod ejus nomen semper prius commemoratur*': lit. 'from the fact that his name is ———'. (Massie.)

'This arises *from your neglecting* my admonitions'—'hoc oritur *inde quod* meas admonitiones *neglexisti*': lit. 'from the fact (or circumstance) that you neglected'. (Inde = ex eo.) (Massie.)

'There is no reason *for his doing* it'—'non est *cur* id *faciat*': lit. 'why he should do it'. (Massie.)

'You were the cause *of my being dismissed*'—'of my dismissal'—'why I was dismissed'—'tu causa fuisti *cur dimitterer*'. (Massie.)

There are Greek constructions exemplifying similar uses of the participle. (We borrow instances from Dr. Donaldson's Greek Grammar.)

ἦσθησαι πωποτέ μου συκοφαντοῦντος: 'have you ever yet seen *me playing* the false accuser?'

οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἑώρων τοὺς στρατιώτας ἀχθομένους—'the generals saw *the soldiers growing* dissatisfied'.

συνέλκων πανταχόθεν τὸ εἶρμα ἐπὶ τὴν γαστέρα νῦν καλουμένην—'drawing together the skin from all sides to that which is now designated as the belly' [lit. 'to *the belly* (as it is) now *designated*].

Κύρῳ ἥδετο οὐ δυναμένῳ σιγᾶν, ἀλλ', ὥσπερ σκύλακι γενναίῳ, ἀνακλάζοντι—'he delighted in Cyrus, *when he* (*Cyrus*) *was unable* to remain silent, but *gave* tongue like a thoroughbred whelp'. We are not at liberty to translate literally: 'he delighted in *Cyrus*, *being unable* to remain silent, but *giving* tongue, &c.'

ἡδομένοισιν ἡμῖν οἱ λόγοι γεγόνασι—'the words have been said to *our satisfaction*'; lit. 'to *us pleased*'.

σύνοιδά σοι ἠδικημένῳ—'I am aware of *your having been wronged*': lit. 'I am aware of *you having been wronged*' (participle).

οὔκουν ἐκεῖν' ἀλλόκοτον, ὁ Θέωρος κόλαξ γενόμενος; lit. 'Was not that a strange thing, *Theorus having become* (participle, nominative) a flatterer?' '*Theorus's having become*' (infin.) would not sound satisfactorily; rather use the clause form.

The Verbal Noun in 'ing'.

There is an almost insensible transition from the infinitive in 'ing' to the verbal abstract noun of the same termination. 'Neither *blessing* nor *cursing* could change him'; here we can hardly say whether 'blessing' and 'cursing' are infinitives or nouns. The test of the Infinitive as contrasted with the Noun is the presence of verb accompaniments, such as an object, or an adverb: 'blessing *him* and cursing *him* were alike ineffectual'; '*greatly* blessing and *severely* cursing were equally unavailing'. If there be not a verb adjunct, the decision would rest on the presence of the noun adjuncts, as the adjective and plural number: '*perpetual* communing is a sign of love', '*blessings* on the man that invented sleep'. The use of the plural shows, however, that the word has passed a stage beyond the verbal abstract noun: for an abstract noun has not the plural until it is first changed into a class noun. 'Here after many dancings, singings, walkings, runnings, wrestlings, and other trying of masterios'. The plurals are all nouns, but not abstract; they are converted with class nouns. We must look upon 'try-

ing' not as an infinitive, but as an abstract noun limited by the adjective 'other'. The infinitive construction would be 'otherwise trying masteries'.

The ambiguity created by so many forms in 'ing' discourages the use of verbal nouns having this genuine English ending, and throws us more upon the Latin part of the vocabulary, which provides us with the characteristic suffix 'ion'. In the matter of sound also, the 'ing', although in itself melodious, is yet apt to be painfully alliterated.

The Gerund.

The infinitive form used to express a purpose, is readily distinguished by this marked signification. In the sentence, the gerund is not the object of a verb like the infinitive, it has the character of either an adverb or an adjective, and may always be expanded into a clause.

I love *to write* (inf.), amo scribere.

I come *to write* (ger.), venio ut scribam.

The gerund here is adverbial.

'A house *to let*'; 'the course to steer by'; 'a place to lie in'; 'a thing to be done'; 'a city to take refuge in'; 'the means to do ill deeds'—are adjective gerunds; they may all be expanded into clauses; 'a house that the owner lets or will let'; 'the course that we should steer by'; 'a thing that should be done'; 'a city wherein one may take refuge'; 'the means whereby ill deeds may be done'.

An old form of the gerund is seen in—'The thief cometh not, but *for* to steal'. In older writers, 'for' is very common before 'to', both with gerunds and with infinitives.

THE AUXILIARY VERBS.

The so-called auxiliary verbs do not merely enter into our scheme of the verb; they also recur incessantly for the expression of most important meanings.

'Shall' and 'Will'.

The distinctive uses of these two auxiliaries are fully given in the Grammar.

It was a grand mistake in the grammars, both English and Latin, to give the future tense of our verb—

I shall or will write.
Thou shalt or wilt write.
He shall or will write.

The alternative forms are totally different meanings. One alternative expresses futurity, the other a present determination. Thus—

I shall write = Lat. *Scribam.*
Thou wilt write = *Scribes.*
He will write = *Scribet.*

This is the future tense, indefinite. The alternative scheme does not express futurity.

I will write = Lat. *volo scribere.*
Thou shalt write = *volo ut scribas.*
He shall write = *volo ut scribat.*

All this is the following out of a determination on the part of one person, committing himself, and imposing an obligation upon two other persons. So—

'The meteor flag of England
Shall yet terrific burn',

must not be parsed as giving 'burn' in the future tense. There is no futurity stated by the verb; it is partly implied from the effect that must succeed the resolution itself; and partly expressed by the adverb 'yet'. The parsing is—third person singular present of the verb 'shall' united with the infinitive 'burn'.

In the New Testament, the simple future is used for resolution, the two ideas not being separated either in the Greek, or in the Latin translation. 'Thou shalt love' *(volo ut ames)* is in Greek ἀγαπήσεις, in Latin *amabis.* On the other hand, the simple 'will' in the second and third persons, suggest-

ing little or nothing more than mere futurity, is frequently used by our translators as a rendering of the emphatic *θέλεις* and *θέλει* in the Greek. Thus: 'Then said Jesus to the twelve, Will ye also go away?' (*μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν;* = Are ye willing, desirous?) (John VI. 67.) 'Wilt thou kill me as thou diddest the Egyptian yesterday?' (*μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις;* = Dost thou wish or intend to kill me?) (Acts VII. 28.) So 'Herodias would have killed him' (*ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι* = was desirous to kill him).

I append some additional examples of the distinctive uses of 'will' and 'shall'.

'I *will* (determination of speaker) make of thee a great nation, and in thee *shall* (favourable and unavoidable result to the 'families', the speaker being more or less associated with it as the cause) all families of the earth be blessed.'

'The Parliament *shall* receive a terrible blow, and *shall* not see who hurts them.' The determining power is external to the subject 'Parliament', and is more or less associated with the speaker.

'If you *will* (action altogether dependent on the person addressed) call at my house in a day or two, you *shall* (promise on part of speaker to person addressed) have a letter of introduction to his lordship.'

'Be angry when you *will*, it *shall* have scope:
Do what you *will*, dishonour *shall* be humour.'

'Be thou as lightning in the eyes of France;
For ere thou canst report I *will* be there,
The thunder of my cannon *shall* be heard.'

The following occurs in Lord Chatham's Despatches and is a correct employment of 'shall':—'As soon as the season of the year, and the navigation of those seas *shall* allow, and in case the force of our fleet under your command *shall* be sufficient——'. The meaning of *eventuality* is expressed.

'As for the duration of the defence, it is my duty to direct that it *shall* (subject 'it' is controlled by the speaker) consist solely of a protest setting forth the violence used, and

of nothing further; that is to say that, as soon as the breach *shall* be opened (eventuality), negotiations *shall* be entered into (speaker's control over negotiations) for the surrender of the town.'

'No weapon that is formed against thee *shall* prosper' (promise—influence of speaker on 'weapon'); and every tongue that *shall* rise (eventuality) against thee in judgment, thou *shalt* condemn (decree of speaker).'

'Whosoever *shall* break (eventuality) one of these least commandments, and *shall* teach (eventuality) men so, he *shall* be called (settled independently of subject 'he', the speaker being associated with the cause) the least in the kingdom of heaven.'

'Whoever *shall* now compare (eventuality) the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, *will* be able (simple future) to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination.' (Macaulay.)

> 'Then *wilt* thou not be loth
> To leave this Paradise, but *shalt* possess
> A paradise within thee.'

Mätzner quotes from Addison: 'You *shall* sometimes know that the mistress and maid *shall* quarrel, ... and at last the lady *shall* be pacified to turn her out of doors, and give her a very good word to everybody else'.

'*Shall* quarrel', *shall* be pacified', are not very far from the meaning expressed by 'will' in the cases just to be cited. But why *shall?* Compare: 'There is not a girl in town, but, let her have her will, in going to mark, and she *shall* dress like a shepherdess'. Might 'shall' indicate that the speaker selects the *special* action predicated?—as a sample of the ongoings.

Hamlet's letter to the King begins: 'High and mighty, *you shall know* I am set naked on your kingdom. . . . '. 'You *shall* know' = 'you *must* know' = 'let me tell you'. The influence of the speaker over the person spoken to is signified by 'shall'.

So: 'An election for a disputed borough *shall* cost the

parties £20,000 or £30,000 each'. (Paley.) The 'shall' may indicate that the speaker supposes the case; 'will' would suggest more definitely an action about to take place in the ordinary course of events.

Sometimes 'will' is used for the present indefinite: 'Accidents *will* happen', the same as—'accidents happen'. The 'will' gives emphasis by a kind of personification; 'accidents take it into their heads, and resolve to happen'.

'Differences, however, arose, as they *will* amongst all communities of the kind'.

'If my valour should leave me! Valour *will* come and go'. (Sheridan.)

'The maidens *will* converse with each other in that manner from cliff to cliff, through storm and tempest, were there a mile between'. (Scott.)

'Any thermometer *will* answer the purpose'. This is really the expression of a universal fact, and ought to be present, 'answers'. The use of 'will' is dramatic; it tells the person addressed to take and try any thermometer, and predicts what the result of the trial will be.

In Interrogation, the auxiliaries are ruled by the same principle. 'Shall' expresses that the subject is under external influence; 'will' implies that the action is entirely within the control of the subject.

The only complete Interrogative forms are those expressing will or determination on the part of the second person.

'*Will you* be this honest gentleman's cupbearer, or *shall I?*' (Pirate, ch. 30.) The action is left in the power of the person addressed: 'are you willing to——?' 'Is it your will or inclination to——?' There is no pressure from without. On the other hand, '*Shall I?*' indicates that the speaker is under outward control,—in this instance, the control of the person addressed. 'If you should think fit not to do the action, then it will fall to me'; the action of the speaker is entirely dependent upon the will of the second person. So, '*Shall he?*' would imply that the speaker expresses the

action of the person 'he' as resting on the will or control of the second person.

'*Will you* give thanks, sweet Kate? or else *shall I*?'

'What *shall we* drink?' I submit my taste to yours: the choice lies with you; yours is the determining voice.

'If we refuse, what *shall we* suffer?' Our fate depends on your will or determination; we are in your power.

'*Shall I* pour your honour out a glass of sack to your pipe?' 'Do, Trim', said my uncle Toby. (Sterne.)

'*Hamlet.* One word more, good lady.
Queen. What *shall* I do?'

The Queen asks Hamlet: 'What *wilt* thou do? thou *wilt* not murder me?' There is more than mere futurity here; the Queen inquires of Hamlet what his own will or resolution is. The action is altogether dependent on Hamlet, who is addressed.

Antony says to the Citizens: '*Shall I* descend? and *will you* give me leave?' The orator professes to be the humble servant of those he addresses.

'*Shall* our coffers, then,
Be emptied to redeem a traitor home?'

The speaker puts it to his hearers to say whether they can reasonably sanction the action.

'*Shall* he expire,
And unavenged?'

I put it to you: whether he shall or shall not rests with you to decide.

'Hector is gone:
Who *shall* tell Priam so, or Hecuba?'

'Who *shall* lay anything to the charge of God's elect? . . . . Who *shall* separate us from the love of Christ? *Shall* tribulation, or distress, or persecution, &c.?'

'What! *shall* an African, *shall* Juba's heir
Reproach great Cato's son?'

Next as to the Interrogative forms available for mere futurity. '*Shall* I?' is already set apart for the case

where the first person acts under the control of the second person or person addressed. Still there is no other form for simple futurity with the first person as subject. '*Will* I?' is obviously impossible as a direct question; yet it is the regular Scotch form.

For enquiring as to a future action on the part of the second person, we have to consider two forms. '*Shall* you?' would naturally inquire as to the influence of external circumstances upon 'you'; and, being not an affirmation but merely a question, it is not considered as at all uncourteous. '*Will* you?' would be the form of courtesy, were the expression of this considered necessary or desirable; it is a form moreover, that is already engaged to make inquiry as to the second person's will or determination. However, 'Will you?' is used for mere futurity side by side with 'Shall you?'

'What *shall* you do?' 'What *will* you do?' '*Shall* you come back to-morrow?'—may inquire as to the future merely. The meaning is—'What *are* you *to* do?' '*Are* you *to* come back?'

For the third person, '*Shall* he?' puts the action as dependent on the second person, and accordingly must be set aside. Apart from this pre-occupation, it might have stood for simple futurity: the motive of courtesy, which caused the substitution of 'will' in the affirmative form, has no influence here. '*Will* he?', while naturally inquiring as to 'his' will, inclination, or determination, is also the form used for the case of mere futurity. '*Will* they be present?' 'Who *will* be next president?' express simple futurity: much the same as '*Are* they *to* be present?' 'Who *is to* be next president?'

> '*Will* it be dark before you reach the tower?'
>
> 'What, *will* the aspiring blood of Lancaster
> Sink in the ground?'

'*Should*' and '*Would*.'

Pupils find great difficulty in parsing these under all their various uses; such as are disposed to err with 'shall' and 'will' still oftener go wrong with the preterites.

The following are the distinctions that have to be kept clearly before us.

First. The regular future—

I shall
Thou wilt } write
He will

becomes—

I should
Thou wouldst } write
He would

and the meaning is, that, under certain circumstances, I shall write. Hence this is called the future of Contingency, or Conditionality.

We cannot have a past future, except in narrative. Referring to some incident of the past, we say, 'it was known that I *should* be there, and that he *would* be there'. This is the transformation of the simple future when we are relating events that have already taken place. This is not in the scheme of the verb.

'I *shall* return' becomes, in indirect speech, 'I said I *should* return'.

'You did better than I *should* have done'.

'I *should* be fatigued if I walked so far'. The position is here stated quite speculatively; the case is merely supposed. If I were to speak of walking so far as a probable action, then I might say: 'I *shall* be fatigued if I walk so far'. The first form is simply the past corresponding to the second form, the meaning being changed to suit a case that is only supposed.

Looking forward to an action that is to take place, I may say: 'I *shall* go out'. Suppose, however, that rain has prevented my going out: I may then say, speaking with refer-

ence to my position before the rain, 'I *should* have gone out, if it had not rained'.

Under similar conditions, 'will' of the second and third persons changes into 'would'. 'You (or 'he', or 'they') *will* be fatigued if you (he, they) walk so far'—becomes 'You (he, they) *would* be fatigued if you walked so far'. 'You (he, they) *will* go out if it do not rain'—'You (he, they) *would* have gone out if it had not rained'. 'You (he, they) *will* return'—'We were sure that you (he, they) *would* return'.

Similarly: 'but for one man, the enemy *would* have crossed the bridge'; 'it *would* be shameful to leave her in such distress'; 'they *would* be glad to hear from you'; 'I have seen him buy such bargains as *would* amaze one'; 'it was announced that a strict inquiry *would* be instituted'.

Second. The form of determination—

I will
Thou shalt } write
He shall

is not a tense of the verb; it does not mean futurity pure and simple; it means determination for the first person, and compulsion for the second and third, and that is all. When the preterites are used—

I would
Thou shouldst } write
He should

the meaning is past or historical determination and compulsion. Speaking of what is past we say—'I *would* not give my consent': 'it was ordered that he *should* proceed'.

'We *will* be satisfied'—the cry of the Citizens to Brutus and Cassius after the murder of Cæsar—means 'We *are determined*, we *have made up our minds*, to get satisfaction'. After a time, one of these Citizens might say in reference to this action: 'we *would* be satisfied'—that is, 'we *were resolved to* be satisfied'.

'I *will* not go' expresses the speaker's resolution prior to

the action spoken of. Regarding the refusal as a thing of the past, the speaker would say 'I *would* not go'; or 'I told them I *would* not go'. "You *shall* be relieved early' is the direct statement of the first person, implying that the relief of the person addressed depends entirely upon his orders. The indirect form under the influence of a past tense is—'I gave orders that you *should* be relieved early'.

'They *shall* be imprisoned' becomes in the indirect form after a past tense—'I decided that they *should* be imprisoned'.

We have seen that 'should' is used when the second or the third person is under the control of the first. It is used also when these persons are under any other controlling influence whatever.

'The Parliament resolved that all pictures . . . *should* be burned'. The burning of the pictures is controlled by the Parliament.

'It was moved that Oates *should* be set at liberty'. The action is noways dependent upon the subject Oates, but rests altogether upon some external power.

'If ye had known me, ye *should* have known my Father also'. Your knowing my Father would have necessarily resulted from your knowing me. The controlling power is altogether external to the subject.

'If ye were blind, ye *should* have no sin'. Your being blind would necessarily carry sinlessness with it. The action is quite beyond the power of the subject.

When the controlling agency is fate, destiny, doom, pre-appointment, 'should' is regularly used, the subject being under an influence that can be neither withstood nor evaded.

'Morgan le Fay saved a knight that *should* have been drowned': '—— she said to the knight that *should* have been drowned'.

'He knew who *should* betray him'. 'Should' indicates that the subject is under the control of destiny; that the course of events will without fail bring it about thus; 'he knew who *was pre-appointed to* betray him', whose fate it was to be to betray him.

'Art thou he that *should* come?' that was destined or appointed to come; that was to come in obedience to certain arrangements made by some other power.

'I hoped thou *should'st* have been my Hamlet's wife':— that events would bring about this result.

'The prophet told me that thou *should'st* surely recover': that thy recovery was ordained, was in the pre-appointed course of events.

To express the past will or determination of any subject in reference to his own actions, we use 'would'.

I would.
You would.
He, they would.

Examples of the first person as subject have already been given. The other persons will now be exemplified.

'You *would* not listen to our advice'; the person addressed refused to listen; 'would' implies the past resolution of the subject.

'Cæsar was offered the crown, but he *would* not take it'. He refused to take the crown; 'would' expresses the subject's determination in the past.

'How often *would* I have gathered thy children together. . . . and ye *would* not!' How often did I wish, was I willing (ἠθέλησα) . . and ye refused, were not willing (καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε).

'When the morning was come, they *would* know how he did' (Pilgrim's Progress); they wanted, wished, desired to know.

'King Pelleas suffered himself to be taken prisoner, because he *would* have a sight of his lady'. Because he wished, was determined, to have a sight.

'The knight said he *would* have the lady, and the dwarf said he *would* have her'. In direct statement, we should have: 'The knight said, 'I *will* have the lady', and the dwarf said, 'I *will* have the lady'.'

'He *will* come' is changed after a past tense into 'he promised that he *would* come'.

'The king said 'I *will* hear the whole', expresses directly, in the king's own words, his willingness, inclination, or resolution at the time he spoke. The indirect form is—'The king said he *would* hear the whole'.

'He said openly that she was the fairest lady that there was, and that he *would* prove upon any knight that *would* say nay'. And that he was ready and willing to prove upon any knight that had a mind to say nay.

For Contingent Determination, we use the forms just mentioned as expressing the past resolution of the subject.

I would.
You would.
He would.

'If I could tell you, I *would*'. The form 'I would' has been given as expressing in present time the 'will' of a time gone by. Here, however, the sense is not past; the action has not taken place, the will of the subject being impeded by a conditional circumstance. 'Would' indicates the will or resolution of the subject in the event of the granting of the conditions.

'Were every tile on those roofs a separate devil, and stood in my way, I *would* go'.

'If every ducat in six thousand ducats
Were in six parts, and every part a ducat,
I *would* not draw them; I *would* have my bond'.

'If you knew all the circumstances, you *would* push on vigorously'. 'Had he been there, he *would* not have tolerated such conduct'. In these cases, 'would' may be regarded as expressing will or determination on the part of the subject under the circumstances mentioned.

But in the second and third persons, it is often a delicate task to discriminate between Contingent Determination and Contingent Futurity merely.

Third. The form of the Future *Subjunctive* in the scheme of the verb is 'should' for all persons alike, dropping the second personal inflection:—

I should
Thou should } write.
He should

The Future Subjunctive form occurs in subordinate clauses after various introducing words, which express variety of relation to the principal clause: 'If my valour *should* leave me!' (Rivals.)

'He was afraid *that* he *should* be burnt'. (Bunyan.)

'The soldiers dreaded *lest* the wound of Scipio *should* prove mortal'.

'He was cast into prison *till* he *should* pay the debt'.

The following examples are quoted by Mätzner:—

'*If* you *should* go near Barnard Castle, there is good ale at the King's Head'. (Dickens.) '*Suppose* he *should* relent . . . with what eyes could we stand in his presence?' (Milton.) '*Should* an individual want a coat, he must employ the village tailor'. (Scott.) 'What was to become of them, *should* their provision fail?' (W. Irving.) '*If* I *should* meet him, I will tell him'. '*If* she *should* take me at my word, where am I then?' (Fielding.)

'Deny that she is mine,
And I will strangle thee, *unless* the lie
Should choke thee first'. (S. Knowles.)

'*Though* an host *should* encamp against me, my heart shall not fear, though war *should* rise against me, in this will I be confident'.

This is the form that must be used when all parties are alike under obligation or compulsion; the case when 'shall' bears its primitive signification. 'It was ordered that I *should* go, that you *should* go, that they *should* go'.

Even without expressed obligation, we use these forms: 'It is strange that I *should* see him there, that you *should* say so', does not state obligation, but implies that the influence is from without, and not from within. 'It is well that you *should* know this'.

From Mätzner:—'I thought I ne'er *should* see thy face again'. (Longfellow.) 'I am sure it is impossible I

should hurt you'. (Fielding.) 'It is no doubt highly desirable that the text of ancient poetry *should* be given untouched and uncorrupted'. (Scott.) 'It is not strange that some zealous Presbyterians *should* have laid up his saying in their hearts, and *should*, at a later period, have attributed it to divine inspiration'. (Macaulay.)

Besides the main forms now detailed, there are one or two special, but by no means uncommon, uses of 'should' and 'would'. In these there is more or less departure from the ordinary meaning.

'Should', with any of the three persons as subject, is used to express *moral* obligation, or *duty*, on the part of the subject. The past form does not convey past meaning: 'I, you, he *should* go' indicates *present* duty. For past duty, the aid of 'have' is called in, the *perfect* infinitive following 'should': 'I, you, he *should* have gone'.

'You have done that you *should* be sorry for': 'you *ought to* be sorry for' gives the meaning.

'One *should* always conciliate'.

'We *should* always prefer duty to pleasure'.

Such hesitating expressions as 'I *should* think', 'it *should* seem', 'it *should* appear', are softened forms for the direct dogmatic 'I *think*', 'it *seems*', 'it *appears*'.

'Would' sometimes loses its past meaning, and signifies very nearly the same as 'wish'. In this use one might perhaps detect a milder, more modest, or hesitating manner of assertion. It seems to be a smoothing down of the form of Contingent Determination.

'I *would* not that any of us were matched with him' (Malory, Morte d'Arthur); that is, if I had my wish. This example shows the transition in a state not far removed from Contingent Determination.

Mätzner quotes the following, comparing them with the French 'je voudrais':—'It was my happiness to own her once . . . I *would* forget her now'. (Sheridan Knowles.) '*Would* to God we had died in the land of Egypt!"

'I *would* advise you to do so' may be completed by some

such condition as, 'if I might speak on the subject'. This is a mild unassuming way of saying 'I *advise* you to do so'.

'I know what I *would* obtain' (Bunyan): that is, if I had my wish. 'I know what I *wish to* obtain' is scarcely different in sense.

'All they wanted, in return, was that, in pursuing our own object side by side with them, we *would* promise not to suffer ourselves to be clogged by our old scruples against breaches of the peace; and that, in order to make our favour the more signal, we *would* consent to turn aside a little from our old friends; that was all'. (Kinglake—The men of the coup d'etat.) 'Would' means 'should be willing'. Were it not for bringing out our will in the matter, the writer would have given 'should'.

'I *would* have Corinth destroyed' becomes in Latin 'Corinthum extinctam esse *volo*' (Donaldson, Lat. Gram.). 'I *wish* to have Corinth destroyed'.

Again, 'would' expresses habitual or intermittent past action on the part of any of the three persons.

'At certain intervals my ambition *would* revive; I *would* despise myself for my tame resignation to my sordid fate'. (Smollett.)

'The Jew *would* hear the merchant's reproaches with seeming patience'. (Lamb.)

'He *would* also walk solitarily in the fields, sometimes reading, sometimes praying'. (Bunyan.)

'They also thought to drive away his distemper by harsh and surly carriage to him; sometimes they *would* deride, sometimes they *would* chide, and sometimes they *would* quite neglect him'. (Bunyan.)

The corresponding usage of 'will' has already been mentioned and exemplified.

Interrogative use of Should and Would. This follows from the first and second heads.

Under the first head is included narrative of the past, with a future bearing. 'Was it known that *I should* be there, and that *he would* be there?' Compulsion and obligation

are alike excluded; the simple fact of futurity is referred to in narrating the past.

Under the same head falls Future Contingency. The meaning is somewhat modified, however, when a question is asked. 'I shall be there' is a simple declaration of a future fact, without any reference to my motives; if a motive be implied, it is that I am to be there, in the course of events, and not from my own express resolution. But to ask 'shall I be there?'—is to enquire whether it will be permitted me to be there, or whether the arrangements that are made are to be such as to cause my presence. It does not ask simple futurity.

Still less is simple futurity asked by the form, '*Should I* be there?' This is an appeal to the authority or to the judgment of another person, as to what I ought to do, or what my resolution is to be. In point of fact, therefore, this question falls under the second head, above given, the forms of determination and compulsion, qualified by the position of a questioner. 'Should I, you, they, be there?' is an enquiry as to whether the several parties are under some motive from without; it is the compulsory power attaching to 'shall' by its own intrinsic meaning.

We may say to one, 'I am afraid your strength will fail you', and receive for reply the question, '*Should* you think so?', a question implying doubt or negation, and capable of being interpreted thus: 'Are the facts and appearances such as to lead you to think so?' which comes strictly under the second situation—the appeal to outward control as affecting the person's conduct.

'Wherefore *should I* fear in the days of evil, when the iniquity of my heels shall compass me about?' 'What are the circumstances or reasons that are to make me afraid?'

'*Should* I, you, he?' is also used to enquire as to the *duty* of the subject.

'*Would* I?' like 'Will I?' is a question that cannot be put. '*Wouldst* thou? *would* he?' may be asked; it enquires the determination of the person addressed, and of the person spoken of, respectively.

A few more instances may be given as miscellaneous examples.

'Though I *should* receive a thousand shekels of silver in mine hand, yet *would* I not put forth my hand against the king's son'. 'Though I *were* to receive'—future subjunctive or conditional, the action not depending on the subject. '*Would* I not'—resolution or determination, under circumstances supposed.

'If you *would* shun worse, walk quietly on'. (Scott.) 'If you *wish* or *desire* to shun worse'. The subject may choose for himself.

'Though I *should* die with thee, I *will* not deny thee'. 'Though I *were* to die'; the subject being under supposed future compulsion. 'I *will* not' is 'I *am determined* not to', the speaker's will being the source of influence.

'A minister who *should* in the present day address to a general on active service such a letter . . *would* be driven from office by universal indignation'. The relative clause implies the notion of conditionality: '*If* any minister *should* address ——'. 'Would', because the action is stated as a merely supposed case.

Macbeth says to the witches, 'You *should* be women'. The general appearance leads the speaker to this conclusion, although the special fact of their having beards forbids him to say positively 'You *are* women'.

'Why *should* you suppose so?' What are the facts that bring you to suppose so? The question is put with some indirectness, by means of 'should'.

'Be not righteous overmuch; neither make thyself overwise; why *shouldest* thou destroy thyself? Be not overmuch wicked, neither be thou foolish; why *shouldest* thou die before thy time?'

'Why *should* ye be stricken any more?'

'What *should* he be doing?' 'Where *should* this music be?' The speaker seems to be hesitating, revolving in his mind the possible ways of satisfactorily answering the question. I wonder where this music is; and, at the same time, I am trying to make it out.

'Knock, sir! whom *should* I knock?' The puzzled, doubtful state of the speaker's mind is indicated. He might say at length: 'Be so good as to tell me whom I should knock—whom you wish me to knock'.

'What good *should* follow this, if this were done?' (Tennyson.) What good *ought* to—do you expect to—follow this? I wonder what good *would* follow. Hesitation or doubt is expressed.

'Now that the Saxon landowners were dispossessed, who *should* patronise the Saxon bard?' (Earle, Phil. of Engl. Tongue, § 40.) The whole position is in past time; the present form would be—'Now that the landowners *are* dispossessed, who *shall* patronise?'—an open question.

'*Should* I have answered Caius Cassius so?' Future contingency interrogative; looked back upon as a supposed case.

'Here I *would* remark that ———'. A conditional statement is implied, the speaker deprecating opposition or insinuating a request for leave. A diffident way of saying 'I *will*, I *wish* to, remark'; '*if you would allow me*, I *would* remark' (contingent determination, softened).

'*Would* the night were come!' '*Would* Banquo were here!' 'I *would* I had been there!' Indirect, yet very strong, expression of a wish.

'Wast thou a monarch,
Me *wouldst* thou make thy queen?' (S. Knowles.)

Contingent determination, or contingent futurity.

'I *should* rejoice now at this happy news': I *ought* to. Were it not for the counter action of certain circumstances, I *should* &c.; hence the meaning passes to 'I *ought*'.

'He wanted that which *should* have been his pass into the Celestial City'.

'And as they *should* have been slain, there came four ladies and besought ———'. Destiny, or pre-appointment.

'Why, 'tis well known that, while I was protector,
Pity was all the fault that was in me;
For I *should* melt at an offender's tears,
And lowly words were ransom for their fault'.

Mätzner interprets 'should' as expressing the nature of the subject; perhaps thus—'it *was my nature* to melt'. Gloucester may, however, imagine himself again in the position of protector with a case before him: 'Were the offender to shed tears, I *should* melt, and lowly words *were* (*would be*) ransom': I could not help melting.

'*Would* I describe a preacher such as Paul,
Were he on earth, *would* hear, approve, and own,
Paul *should* himself direct me. I *would* trace
His master strokes, and draw from his design.
I *would* express him simple ———'.

'If the lions *should* meet with me in the dark, how *should* I shift them? How *should* I escape being by them torn in pieces?' (Bunyan.)

'Lewis was willing that the Irish regiments *should* be sent to him in rags and unarmed, and insisted only that the men *should* be stout, and the officers *should* not be bankrupt traders and discarded lacqueys'. (Macaulay.)

'Gentlemen, the dread of any such reflection *would* be as unmanly and unworthy of you as the reflection itself *would* be unjust. . . . But even if there *should*, in the eyes of some, be room for the reflection, light indeed *would* that reflection be, compared with the opposite one, which as surely awaits you, if you *shall* have the boldness, or I *should* call it the rashness, to follow the course that the public prosecutor has pointed out.' (Duncan M'Neill.)

The following is from 'Abbott's Shakespearian Grammar' (1st edition, p. 77, § 146): Applied to inanimate objects, a 'wish' becomes a 'requirement':—

'I have bought
Golden opinions from all sorts of people,
Which *would* (require to) be worn now in their newest gloss.'

'Words
Which *would* (require to) be howled out in the desert air."

Clearly, there is a close connection between 'it requires' and 'it ought.' Thus: 'This *would* (require to) be done

with a demure abasing of your eye sometimes'. (Bacon's Essays.)

'May' and 'Can.'

These are now disused as regards making up portions of the regular verb; the potential mood not being any longer required. They are so far entitled to be called auxiliary verbs, that they are usually taken along with another verb, which states the principal action: 'I *may* go', 'I *can* see'.

The distinction of the two verbs is plain; yet they are liable to be confounded, especially by Scotchmen. A newspaper, in noticing a book, used this expression: 'We *cannot* print the whole, but must give extracts merely'. Now there was no *physical* impossibility in the case; a newspaper could print a book entire, as easily as it could print its ordinary news. The difficulty was moral, it lay in the want of permission; the author's consent was necessary in the first instance; instead of 'cannot', the writer should have said '*may* not', or used an equivalent phrase, 'we are not at liberty', or 'not permitted'.

In the expression of the angel to Lot—'I *cannot* do anything till thou be come hither', 'cannot' is used for moral inability.

From want of permission results, in a figurative sense, physical inability: my hands are tied—I *cannot* do anything.

The following show the third usages:—

> 'He *may* not, as unvalued persons do,
> Carve for himself'.

He is not at liberty to do so.

> 'But of this tree we *may* not taste or touch;
> *God so commanded*'.

'Who *can* advise, *may* speak'. (Milton.) Whoever *has ability* (mental capacity) to advise, *is at liberty* (is permitted) to speak.

To express probability or possibility, 'may' is employed: 'we may come', 'it may be so'; but there is not much delicacy or nicety in the expression. Better use the adverbs or

adverbial phrases made from the words 'probable', 'possible', 'likely': 'we shall probably, or possibly, come'.

'What *may* the king's whole battle reach unto?'

The speaker asks a probable estimate; he does not expect that the person questioned can give the exact number, and he shows by the question that he looks for nothing beyond the approximate number.

'*Must*'.

This word means compulsion, or unavoidable inference. It is interesting as an illustration of a verb devoid of inflections; and shows us what we should have to do, if all our verbs were uninflected. As regards number and person, we should feel quite indifferent. The only thing to provide for would be *Time*. Now with 'must' we see what is required. For future time, we simply append an adverb or phrase of futurity: 'we must go *soon*, to-night, next week'. For past time, the same course might have been open to us; adverbs of past time accompanying the verb could have given it a past action: 'he must *formerly* go', 'he must *then* go'. Usage, however, not satisfied with this device, has coupled it with a perfect infinitive of the principal verb: 'we must formerly, at that time, *have gone*'.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD.

The Subjunctive Mood, as a distinct inflection, is dying out in the language; yet, so long as it is retained, it may be useful in indicating differences of meaning.

The chief occasion for it is to express a condition; 'if I be there, I will speak'. The conditional meaning is imparted by the conjunction; but even with the conjunction, we make a difference between 'If I *am*' and 'If I *be*', 'If I *was*' and 'If I *were*'.

With 'if' there is always an insinuation of doubt; the entire absence of doubt would be better given in another way; for 'if he *is* to be there', with the implication that

he is actually to be there, could be put—'*as, since, seeing that, inasmuch as*, he is to be there'. A way of expressing the pure conditionality or dependence of one fact upon another, without saying whether the condition is or is not likely to be realised, is 'Supposing, on the supposition that, assuming, on the assumption that'. This is often all that 'if' means, especially in the language of science and of art: '*If* a pendulum be drawn to one side, it will swing to the other'; '*If* you sow, you will reap'. This is the most familiar way of stating the dependence of one assertion upon a second. Another way is seen in the text—'Is any afflicted? Let him pray.'. Or again—'Scratch a Russian, and you will see the Tartar'. These two modes have a certain figurative boldness. Farther, 'the circumstances being altered, that alters the case'; a not unfrequent form of conditionality.

It is the fact that the subjunctive forms, 'be', 'were', are used when there is doubt as to the fulfilling of the condition, but they are as often used in cases of bare dependence; especially 'be', which is employed in scientific statements. There is nothing to justify these usages. The case most suited to the subjunctive is *contingent futurity*, or the expression of an event unknown absolutely, as being still in the future: 'If to-morrow *be* fine, I will walk with you'.

'Unless I *were* prepared', insinuates pretty strongly that I am or am not prepared, according to the manner of the principal clause.

'What's a tall man unless he *fight*?'

'The sword hath ended him: so shall it thee,
Unless thou *yield* thee as my prisoner'.

'Who but must laugh, if such a man there *be*?
Who would not weep, if Atticus *were* he?'

'I am to second Ion if he *fail*'; the failing is left quite doubtful. 'I should very imperfectly execute the task which I have undertaken, if I *were* merely to treat of battles and sieges'. Macaulay thus implies that the scope of his work is to be wider than mere battles and sieges.

The subjunctive appears in some other constructions. 'I

hope to see the Exhibition before *it close*'; 'wait till he *return*'; 'thou shalt stand by the river's brink against he *come*'; 'take heed lest passion *sway* thy judgment'; 'speak to me, though it *be* in wrath'; 'if he *smite* him with an instrument of iron so that he *die*, he is a murderer'; 'it was indifferent to him whether the name of Edward, or that of Henry, *were* employed in the articles of the treaty'. (Hume.) 'Beware this night that thou *cross* not my footsteps'.—(Shelley.)

Again. 'Whatever this *be*'; 'whoever he *be*'; 'Howe'er it *be*' (Tennyson); and such like.

'And *as long*, O God, *as* she
Have a grain of love for me,
So long, no doubt, no doubt,
Shall I nurse in my dark heart,
However weary, a spark of will
Not to be trampled out.'

The Future Subjunctive is given in our scheme of the verb as 'should' in all persons: 'If I should, if thou should, if he should'. In old English, we have 'thou *shouldst*': 'if thou, Lord, *shouldst* mark iniquities'

An inverted conditional form has taken deep root in our language, and may be regarded as an elegant and forcible variety. While dispensing with the conjunction, it does not cause ambiguity; nevertheless, conditionality is well marked.

'*If* you *should* abandon your Penelope and your home for Calypso, ——': '*should* you abandon ——'.

'*Go* not my horse the better,
I must become a borrower of the night
For a dark hour or twain'.

'Here had we now our country's honour roof'd,
Were the graced person of our Banquo present'.

'*Be* thou a spirit of health or goblin damn'd,
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell,
Be thy intents wicked or charitable,
Thou comest in such a questionable shape
That I will speak to thee'.

'*Come* one, *come* all, this rock shall fly
From its firm base as soon as I'. (Scott.)

The following examples are given by Mätzner:—

'Varney's communications, *be* they what they might, were operating in his favour'. (Scott.)

'Governing persons, *were* they never so insignificant intrinsically, have for most part plenty of Memoir-writers'. (Carlyle.)

'Even *were* I disposed, I could not gratify the reader'. (Warren.)

'Bring them back to me, *cost* what it may'. (Coleridge, Wallenstein.)

'And *will* you, *nill* you, I will marry you'. (Taming of Shrew.)

Were is used in the principal clause for 'should be' or 'would be'. *

'I *were* (= should be) a fool, not less than if a panther
Were panic-stricken by the antelope's eye,
If she escape me'. (Shelley.)

'Thou *wert* (= wouldst be) better gall the devil, Salisbury'.

'Were you but riding forth to air yourself,
Such parting *were* too petty'.

'He *were* (= would be) no lion, were not Romans hinds'.

'Should he be roused out of his sleep to-night,
It *were* not well; indeed it *were* not well'. (Shelley.)

Had is sometimes used in the principal clause for 'should have' or 'would have'. †

'I *had* (= should have) fainted, unless I had believed'. (Ps. xxvii.)

'Had I known this before we set out, I think I *had* (= would have) remained at home'. (Scott.)

* So, in German, *wäre* for *würde s in*. 'Hatt' ich Schwingen, hätt' ich Flügel, nach den Hügeln *zög'* ich hin', for '*würde* ich *ziehen*'.

† So, in German, *hätte* occurs for *würde haben*. 'Wäre er da gewesen, so *hätten* wir ihn gesehen': for 'so *würden* wir ihn gesehen *haben*.' *Hätten* is still conditional, not indicative. In Latin, the pluperfect *indicative* is occasionally used; which is explained as a more vivid form.

'Hadst thou been kill'd when first thou didst presume,
Thou *hadst* not lived to kill a son of mine'.

'If he
Had killed me, he *had* done a kinder deed'.

'For once he *had* been ta'en or slain,
An it had not been his ministry'. (Scott.)

'If thou hadst said him nay, it *had* been sin'. *

'*Had* better, rather, best, as lief, as well, &c.', is a form that is explained under this heading. 'Had' stands for 'would have'. The exploded notion that 'had' is a corrupted 'would' must be guarded against.

'I *had* as lief not be'. That is—'I *would* as lief *have* not (*to*) be' = 'I would as willingly (or as soon) have non-existence'.

'*Had* you rather Cæsar were living ——?' '*Would* you rather *have* (*would* you *prefer* that) Cæsar were living?'

'He *had* better reconsider the matter' is 'he *would* better *have* (*to*) reconsider the matter'.

'I *had* rather be a kitten and cry mew
Than one of these same metre ballad-mongers,
I *had* rather hear a brazen canstick turned'.

Let us compare this form with another that appears side by side with it in early writers. (Cp. Lat. 'habeo' and "mihi est'.)

The construction of 'had' is thus illustrated in Chaucer, as in—Nonne Prestes Tale, 300:

'By God, I *hadde* levere than my scherte,
That ye hadde rad his legend, as I have.'

Compare now:

'Ah *me were levere* with lawe *loose* my lyf
Then so to fote hem *falle*." (Wright, Polit. S.)

Here 'were' is unquestionably for 'would be'; and the whole expression might be given by 'had', thus: 'Ah *I*

* In *principal* clauses the inflection of the second person is always retained: 'thou hadst'. 'thou wouldst, shouldst', &c. In the example, the subordinate clause, although subjunctive, shows 'hadst'. And this usage is exceedingly common.

hadde levere ———', '(to) *loose*' and '(to) *falle*', changing from subjects of 'were' to objects of 'hadde'.

So, in the Chaucer example above, if we substitute 'be' for 'have', we shall get the same meaning, thus: 'By God, *me were* levere ———'. The interchange helps us to see more clearly that 'hadde' is to be explained as subjunctive for 'would have'.

THE TENSES.

Present Tense (*Indefinite*). It cannot be too strongly borne in mind that this is the Universal Tense, or the means of expressing universal truth, or permanent arrangements. It signifies present, past, and future all together.

The chief occasion of mistake on this point is when a universal truth is stated as maintained or denied by some one in the past. 'He denied that Electricity and Magnetism *are* (not *were*) the same agent'. 'Such a man would not admit that two and two *is* four'. 'A Latin poet once sang that freedom never *flourishes* more brightly than it *does* under a righteous king'. (Freeman.)

'Water *seeks* the lowest level'.

'Time and tide *wait* for no man'.

'Still waters *run* deep'.

'Blunt wedges *rive* hard knots'.

'The evil that men *do*, *lives* after them;
The good *is* oft interred with their bones'.

'Small curs *are* not regarded when they *grin*;
But great men *tremble* when the lion *roars*'.

To limit an action to the present time, so as to exclude past and future, we either use an adverb, or trust to the knowledge of the circumstances. There is a ceremonial present, in performing some official act; as, 'I give, declare, admit, pronounce, sentence', which we know from the nature of the case to be a present act. Even then, it is not unusual to couple the adverb 'now'.

In calling meetings, there is a superfluity, and therefore an inelegance, in saying—'The Committee *will* meet on

Thursday next'. Say rather—'The Committee *meets* on Thursday'. I once overheard the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, ask—'*Does* the House meet *to-morrow?*'

In other languages, the usage is the same: poeta *nascitur*, orator *fit*.

The present tense, indefinite, is the pure verb, without any expression for time at all. It is nearest the verbal root; the past and the future are formed by *grafting* syllables upon it, or by conjoining auxiliary words. When we are designating the action, as such, without reference to time; when we are stating one action, to the exclusion of others, we use the bare, naked verb, although said to be in the present tense. '*Do* you admit that?' 'No, I *deny* it'.

DERIVATION.

SOURCES OF THE VOCABULARY.

THE practical end of reviewing the sources of our vocabulary is to compare the respective merits in composition of the Saxon and the Classical parts of the vocabulary. With the Saxon, in this comparison, we take in also the Celtic, which, though philologically very different, furnishes a similar class of names—the names of the more common and familiar things. *

Classical terms are introduced not simply to supply names for things not otherwise named; they are still more extensively employed for meanings already expressed by words of home growth; so that, in many instances, we have a choice of terms—Saxon and Classical. We can say—happiness or felicity, luck or fortune, knowledge or cognition, mistake or error.

The two classes of words have their special advantages, and should be employed, not indiscriminately, but with reference to the purpose of the speaker.

First, as regards the Saxon or native words:—

1. These are more easily and readily *understood* by the

* Objections are taken to the use of the word 'Saxon', as implying an untenable theory respecting the origin of the English language. There is not, however, any other name but would be equally misleading in different ways. The term 'English' would not be generally received in any other meaning than to signify the language as it is now made up of a wide diversity of ingredients; while 'Old English' points more particularly to an earlier stage in the Grammar of the language. In the phraseology of literary criticism, 'Saxon' has long been used as a general name for the native or Teutonic part of our present speech: and it may be sufficiently guarded to serve that purpose still without involving any hypothesis as to the special Teutonic dialect that gave origin to the English tongue.

mass of the people, and especially the uneducated. A 'mistake' is more intelligible than error, fallacy, or sophism; 'clever' or 'skilful' is better understood than 'sagacious', 'ingenious', 'dexterous'; 'food' is more familiar than 'aliment', 'nutriment', 'victuals', 'viands'. Compare 'lie' with 'falsehood', 'fiction', 'fabrication'; 'mad' with 'infatuated', 'insane'; 'roar' with 'clamour', 'exclamation'.

2. Saxon words are especially connected with the *feelings* of the great mass of the people. The home affections are more strongly roused by the Saxon names—'father, child, wife', than by such words as 'parental, filial, and marital relationships'. So the vituperative language of native growth is best calculated to rouse the shame or the indignation of the common people: 'rogue', 'rascal', 'blackguard' are more strongly felt by them than 'malefactor', 'miscreant', or even 'villain'.

Next, as regards the Classical words:—

1. They are necessary to scientific and technical precision. What our Saxon words state vaguely, the classical derivatives express precisely. 'Knowledge' is wide and vague, 'science' is distinct and well-defined. 'Bad' has a wide latitude of meaning, 'criminal' has a more limited and determined meaning. 'Speech' and 'words' are not so precise as 'vocables' and 'vocabulary'. 'Readable' has a wide signification; 'legible' is narrow and precise. Compare, in like manner, 'wander' with 'travel'; 'old' with 'ancient', 'antiquated', 'archaic', 'longevity'; 'think' with 'cogitate'; 'bent' with 'inclination', 'proclivity'; 'feeling' with 'consciousness'; 'mistake' with 'error', 'fallacy', 'sophism', 'paralogism'; 'only' with 'unique'; 'skilled' with 'expert'; 'wrath' with 'retribution', 'nemesis'; 'friendly' (or big-minded) with 'liberal', 'catholic', 'cosmopolitan'; 'town' with 'capital', 'metropolis'.

The mere multiplication of ideas to be expressed throws us upon the classical part of our language. From the one fact indicated by the word 'make', there spreads out a variety of situations needing to be named; and instead of

finding Saxon terms, or working up combinations of these, recourse is had to Latin and Greek: factor, agent, actor, creator, poet, manufacturer, artizan. So also 'going' branches out into 'travelling', 'journeying', 'proceeding', 'advancing', 'retreating', 'retiring', 'departing'; and while the vague 'going' is Saxon, the more definite terms are of classical origin. We are not content with 'go on', 'go forward', 'go back (-ward)', 'go away'.

The refinements and the precision of legal phraseology, demand a frequent resort to the classical part of the language. The leading terms—legal, civil, criminal, ecclesiastical, court, evidence, proof, procedure, judge, counsel, jury, advocate, verdict, penalty, punishment, offence, culprit, jurisprudence—are Latin (some through the French) or else Greek. Our Acts of Parliament are highly latinized, in spite of its being desirable that the law should be understood by the least educated of the community.

While the Saxon words are often of wide and vague signification, precise names for generalities or abstractions are taken, by preference, from the classical part of the vocabulary. This is partly owing to the circumstance that the Greeks and the Romans were much more advanced in general views than the Teutonic tribes. The leading names in the sciences are sufficient evidence of this. In geometry, for example, we have 'point, line, angle, circle, curve, parallel, rectilineal, polygon', and innumerable others. Many of these meanings are given also in plain Saxon words—'dot, score, round, straight, many-sided'—but the precise definitions of the science are connected, not with the Saxon words, but with the others.

2. The classical words are more dignified in their associations. The Saxon part of the vocabulary, while favourable to feeling and pathos, contains also the coarse and vulgar words of the language. The Latin and Greek words not only are freer from coarseness, but also are associated with dignity or elevation. For Saxon 'stink', we have 'malodour'. 'Courtezan, concubine, prostitute' are more refined classical equivalents for a strong coarse Saxon word.

3. The classical element of our language enters into the loftiest kinds of oratory. This is partly due to the last-mentioned circumstance, the greater dignity of the associations (in the minds of the better educated classes), but not wholly. It has to do with the sound of the words. The Saxon root words are mostly of one syllable, never more than two; their compounds by prefixes and endings do not yield a flowing melody at all comparable to classical words. Compare 'roundness' with 'rotundity'; 'shake' with 'agitate'; 'for aye' with 'eternal' or 'immortal'.

Hence speakers and writers aiming at elevated and magniloquent diction prefer the classical vocables to the Saxon.

When these motives are not present, preference should be given to the Saxon, by reason of its great advantages, which have to be renounced when the classical element is made to prevail.

Examples of the two Vocabularies:

The Saxon words connected with political notions—town, borough, kingdom, sway, head, lord, folk, freedom—are supplemented by many times their number from classical sources:—city, civil, urban, empire, country, realm, county, magistrate, prince, ruler, commander, authority, administration, people, nation, president, throne, sceptre, reign, state, royal, absolute, dominion, military, dictator, official, executive, legal, legislative, liberty, political, policy, politics, police, tyrant, despotism, dynasty, democracy, aristocracy, oligarchy, anarchy.

All the foregoing principles find illustration in this series of words. The Saxon words are more generally understood, and more homely in their associations. The others are adapted to a more complicated system of government and of public institutions; they are more definite in their scope, and express new and various situations; they are also the terms of a more dignified and elevated style.

Take next the terms for moral good and evil. Pure Saxon (or native):—Good, lofty, high, great, worthy, well-doing,

meet, heart, right, righteous, upright, fair, good behaviour, unselfish, high-minded, heavenly, heaven-born, god-like, becoming, fitting, straightforward, even-handed, true, trusty, manly, handsome, sinless, righteous, undefiled, guiltless, spotless, harmless, childlike, dovelike, lamblike, forgiving, thankful, lovely, sweet, dear, soft-hearted, fellow-feeling. Evil, wrong, wicked, bad, sin, unfair, little, mean, low, knave, worldling, foul, loathsome, worthless, trothless, trustless, heartless, crooked, slippery, paltry, thief, sneak, cut-throat, naughty, forswear, job, spot, blot, unhandsome, unbecoming, unbeseeming, unseemly, unbefitting, unmanly, unrighteous, selfish, self-seeker, worldly, earthly, blackguard, rogue, rascal, wretch, liar, slut, turncoat, unbeliever, backslider, tuft-hunter, guilty, lost, sunk, narrow-minded, one-sided, hard-hearted, seared, astray, dregs, sink of wickedness, black, hellish, fiend, shameful, outlaw. The terms of opprobium or reproach that are native are thus pretty numerous; and they could be greatly added to, by citing the names for special vices—as sloth, intemperance, sexual incontinence.

The following list of terms for good and evil derived from classical sources, will show how largely we have benefited by the ancient languages. A good many words imported at an early period from Norman French (some not classical originally) have become so diffused and so familiar, that they are practically the same to us as our native terms. To these we must add the terms brought in by Christianity, which have also become household words. There is still, however, after the enumeration of these, a large reserve of words exemplifying the special and recondite characteristics that we have ascribed to the classical element of our language.

Good qualities:—Virtue, integrity, noble, honest, just, moral, conscientious, strict, honourable, equitable, impartial, faithful, loyal, constant, (high) principle, incorruptible, candid, veracious, single, dutiful, meritorious, exemplary, deserving, admirable, excellent, laudable, commendable, irreproachable, unerring, inviolable, pure, faultless, clear, elevated, perfect, undepraved, ingenuous, scrupulous, punc-

tilious, innocent, blameless, impeccable, tender, generous, liberal, chivalrous, magnanimous, heroic, saint-like, dignified, sublime, angelic, seraphic, (self)-denying, devoted, disinterested, (self)-sacrifice, (self)-abnegation, sympathising, altruism.

Bad qualities :—Vice, iniquity, improbity, immoral, erring, dishonest, illiberal, disloyal, transgressor, infidel, turpitude, misconduct, mischief, base, vile, gross, false, (un)scrupulous, (un)principled, ignominy, infamy, disgrace, dishonour, (un)-dignified, indecorous, incorrect, imperfect, perfidy, treachery, traitor, criminal, culpable, blamable, reprehensible, discreditable, disreputable, exceptionable, offending, delinquent, malefactor, insidious, disingenuous, malversation, dereliction, recreant, apostate, betrayer, renegade, (time)-server, polluted, dissolute, degenerate, demoralized, corrupted, miscreant (Campbell's translation of 'raca'), scoundrel, reptile, viper, truant, villain, monster, ruffian, demon, abominable, disgusting, abandoned, obdurate, incorrigible, irreclaimable, (un)sympathising, interested, (self)-indulgent, egotist, (un)-generous, mercenary, graceless, (un)gracious, callous.

These are a sample of the terms entering into poetry, popular address, the oratory of moral suasion, and moral education as conducted by praise and blame. All the distinctive merits of the two styles might be exemplified by means of them; on the one hand, the intelligible, the familiar, and the strong; on the other, the discriminating and the elevated.

Another great department, also within the ethical and poetical vocabulary—pleasures, pains, and higher emotions—if given in the same way, would be equally instructive. Take Pleasures. *Native:*—happy, blest, glad, merry, well, toothsome, nice, snug, sweet, soft, thrilling, heavenly, blithe, airy, lively, playful, laughter, chuckle, smile, tickle, snigger, smirk, grin, gloat, fun. *Classical:*—Pleasure, joy, charm, delight, felicity, gratify, satisfy, fruition, comfort, cheer, relish, engaging, attractive, animating, agreeable, captivating, delectable, beatitude, enchantment, transport, rapture, ravishment, ecstasy, elysium, celestial, halcyon (time), palmy

(days), jubilation, fascination, seraphic [Hebrew], luxury, indulgence, regale, commend, console, approve, encourage, elate, exult, triumph, jocund, amuse, interest, divert, entertain, recreate, solace, relax, jocose, ludicrous, convivial, festive, gay, jollity, saturnalia, riot, revel, sport, hedonism, eudæmonism.

The Latin form, 'Smoking is *prohibited*', is wholly unnecessary. The word 'forbid' is at once plain and energetic. In legal style, we do not court variety of phrase, and the full scope of prohibition is given by the Saxon word. The Latin form has its advantage in the verbal noun 'prohibition'. There is not a regular abstract noun of the verb 'forbid'; yet there might have been the same derivative as from 'begin'; 'a beginn*ing* was made'. But we do not call such forms an unmixed good, seeing that they confound the verbal noun with the participle and the infinitive in 'ing'. The Latin verbal noun in 'ion' is remarkable for its distinctiveness.

The word 'bid' is often unnecessarily displaced by the importations 'require', 'command', 'enjoin'. In the Shorter Catechism, there are two questions under each of the ten commandments—'What is *required* in the first commandment?' 'What is forbidden?' We might surely say—'What is *bidden?*' For the 'ten *commandments*', we might have had the 'ten *laws*'. The questions could have run—'In the first law, what is bidden?' 'What is forbidden?'

The names for scientific instruments are nearly all Greek —thermometer, barometer, photometer, hydrometer. Such an exception as 'rain-gauge' [hybrid, 'pluviometer'] shows that we were not compelled to go to the Greek in every instance; 'heat-gauge', 'air-weight-gauge', 'light-gauge', 'wet-gauge', might have been employed with some benefit and little harm. On the other hand, it may be said that the ending 'meter' is soon learned, and that the conjoined words 'thermo', 'baro', 'photo', 'hydro', are of such frequent use that the mere English scholar generally knows them. Moreover, they have the advantage of being free from mis-

leading associations. The Germans have 'Thermometer' and 'Wärmemesser' (warmth-measurer), 'Barometer' and 'Wetterglas' (weather-glass), &c. &c.: making native compounds in all departments of knowledge. We are almost entirely given over to the classical names.

'I *agree*, I *concur* with you', is often a needless departure from the emphatic Saxon, 'I am at *one* with you'.

Instead of '*ignoring* the *existence* of a particular person', which has a certain precision, we may obtain more familiar forms adequate to the occasion, from such well known verbs as 'know', 'leave', 'heed', 'pass by'. 'The statute ignores the existence of dissenting sects'; 'the statute leaves out (the mention of) dissenters'.

'Existing Institutions' has a fine Saxon rendering—'Things as they are'.

'Lays of *ancient* Rome' could have been 'Lays of *old* Rome'.

It is of some practical consequence to observe that, while the leading terms of science, law, and business, should be discriminating and accurate, yet these need not be retained throughout the exposition. On the first presentation of a difficult idea, or in the enunciation of a principle, we are unable to dispense with the most precise words, however learned they be; but after these are fairly launched, we may indulge in the less exact, but more suggestive, Saxon equivalents. The statement of the law of gravity requires us to use the technical terms 'attraction', 'gravitation', but in the iteration, and in the examples, we take such words as 'weights', 'falling bodies', 'heavy', 'pull', 'fast', 'slow'. 'It was asserted by the followers of Aristotle that a ten-pound weight would fall to the ground ten times as fast as a one pound weight. Galileo let two such weights drop from the top of the leaning tower of Pisa; and they both reached the ground very nearly together; the larger weight being slightly before the other' (Balfour Stewart). These sentences are almost pure Saxon.

When we have once designated a peculiar kind of primary doctrine as an 'Axiom', we may afterwards vary the desig-

nation to 'principle', 'doctrine', 'truth', 'saying',—all more familiar than the proper scientific word, and not misleading us, after the teacher has made known the distinctive features of the Axiom.

The other case, namely, the unsuitable introduction of Saxon words, is less common, but not unknown. A 'writer' for an 'author' is admissible when the sense shows that a literary man or writer of books is intended; but 'author' is undoubtedly the most exact and suitable word. Also, the Greek termination 'grapher' is very useful in designating authors with reference to their departments—as geographer, bibliographer, historiographer, logographer; and gives us besides the names—lithographer, photographer.

The streaks and lines of debris on the glaciers are termed '*dirt*-bands'; a gratuitous employment of a coarse Saxon word, aggravated by a wrong meaning. The word primarily and prominently carries with it the idea of impurity from vegetable or animal decomposition; and is loosely extended to inorganic mud, which mars the cleanliness of our dress. For the present application, 'debris', 'rubbish', 'mud', or some such term would seem preferable.

So '*dirt*-beds', are certain dark-coloured loam-like beds that occur between the oolitic limestones and sandstones of Portland.

'*Dirt*-pies might be '*mud*-pies' without loss of accuracy.

A poet is sometimes called by the Saxon term 'singer', which is wanting in aptness to the modern poet. The Welsh name 'bard' might have answered our purpose, without requiring a resort to the classical languages.

In old English a poet was a 'maker'.

> 'And hath he skill to *make* so excellent
> Yet hath so little skill to bridle love?' (Spenser.)

The same occurs several times in 'Piers the Plowman'.

Our translation of the Bible is usually referred to as showing most remarkably the force of the Saxon element in our language, whereby it is intelligible, familiar, and home-going. These qualities it certainly possesses in a very high degree; but as the translators seem to have been guided

rather by an unconscious tact, which must sometimes have failed them, than by a deliberate preference of Saxon words, the statement must be received with some qualifications. A short account of their way of employing both the Saxon and the classical vocabularies will still farther illustrate the principles already laid down.

When emotional effect is chiefly aimed at, the translators often give the Saxon in great purity. Thus:—'For I know that my *Redeemer* liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms *destroy* this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.' Here there are only two classical words, and both quite familiar. Many such examples might be produced from the Psalms. The 23rd is a good specimen; excepting the 5th verse, which contains so many as *five* classical words, the other five verses have in all no more than five such terms. Robert Hall remarks on the Saxon melody and pathos of the last verse: '*Surely* goodness and *mercy* shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.'

So also in passages characterised by great simplicity, the Saxon vocabulary is used in abundance. Here the Gospels furnish numerous examples. The following is exceedingly simple, and contains only three Latin words: 'Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a *rock;* and the rain *descended*, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not; for it was *founded* upon a *rock*.' The parable of the sower (Matt. xiii. 3-9) is a similar passage of much simplicity, and here the translation is still purer Saxon: of 106 words used in the whole parable, only *three* are classical—'devoured', 'scorched', 'fruit'. The introduction to John is even more remarkable; in the first *ten* verses, there is but one word, excepting a proper name, that is not of native origin—'comprehended'.

The advantage of the Saxon style of the authorised English translation, for popular impressiveness and general in-

telligibility, is best seen when it is compared with others of a more Latinized character. Such a comparison has frequently been instituted with the Douay and Rheims (Roman Catholic) version. The following words are given as specimens of the Latinized English so extensively employed by these translators: 'odible', 'suasible', exinanite', contristate', 'postulations', 'coinquinations', 'agnition', 'zealatour', 'donar'. (Trench, English Past and Present, p. 38.) Principal George Campbell's translation of the Gospels, though not carrying the use of classical words so far as this, is from the same cause less simple than the common version. The following examples will illustrate this statement. 'A *city situate* on a *mountain* must be *conspicuous*', is not so simple as, 'A *city* that is set on an hill cannot be hid'. 'The foxes have *caverns*, and the birds of the *air* have places of shelter, but the Son of man hath not where to *repose* his head' is not so touching as the purer Saxon, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the *air* have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head'. The following larger passage will show the contrast: 'But as to the *vicious servant*, who shall say within himself, My *master deferreth* his *return*, and shall *presume* to beat his fellow-*servants*, and to *feast* and *carouse* with drunkards, the *master* of that *servant* will come on a day when he is not *expecting* him, and at an *hour* he is not *apprised* of, and having *discarded* him, will *assign* him his *portion* with the *perfidious*'. Here the advantage of easy intelligibility is noticeably on the side of the common version, which has only about half as many classical terms: see Matt. xxiv. 48-51.

While, however, the great majority of words in the English Bible are native, there is necessarily also a considerable mixture of the classical element. One reason of this is that the terms in use for designating ideas peculiar to Judaism or Christianity had mostly been derived from Latin. The following are examples of such words; some of them were originally Greek, though received by us through the Latin:— evangelist, apostle, bishop, baptism; grace, inspiration, salvation, redemption, regeneration, propitiation, mediator,

repent, justify, sanctify, saint, elect, resurrection, eternal, immortal; miracle, angel, antichrist, creation, sacrifice, circumcision.

These have become household words. In so far as they represent easy conceptions—as 'evangelist', 'baptism'—we are as much at home with them as we should have been with native terms. In so far as they signify the more abstruse doctrines of Christianity or the deep operations of religious life—'inspiration', 'mediator', 'justify', 'sanctify'—they are so peculiar, not to say technical, that Saxon equivalents, even if such were always available, would assist us little in understanding them; and indeed many people take them only as words of emotion.

In other cases the desire for precision made it necessary to have recourse to the classical element. The Saxon words, as we have seen, are more vague and undiscriminating; and this defect must be specially felt, when the object is to represent, by a literal translation, the exact meaning of a foreign author. On that ground, a good number of the Latin terms employed by our translators may be justified. It was avowedly for this reason that Campbell introduced considerably more of the classical element than had been used in our version. While he has thus lost in simplicity and its attendant advantages, he has gained in exactness of rendering. Thus the phrase *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* or *τοῦ θεοῦ*, which our translators always render by '*kingdom* of heaven' or 'of God', is translated by Campbell as *reign* when it refers to time, and *kingdom* only when it refers to place. So *γέεννα* and *ᾅδης*, confounded in our translation under the one rendering, 'hell', are distinguished as *hell* and *hades*. 'Whosoever heareth these my *precepts*, I will *compare* to a *prudent* man' is more precise than the Saxon, 'Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, I will liken him unto a wise man'. 'I am not come to *subvert*, but to *ratify*' is definite, while the more familiar 'I am not come to *destroy*, but to fulfil' is also more vague.

But allowing for those cases where the use of classical words was really necessary, there are still in the English

Bible a considerable number of such terms that might readily, not to say advantageously, have been avoided. The following are some examples along with Saxon equivalents: Interpretation (meaning), salutation (greeting), vocation (calling), cogitation (thought), convocation (meeting, *frequent in the Pentateuch*), malefactor (evildoer), instructor (teacher), communion (fellowship), insurrection (rising), importunity (earnestness), frontier (border), remission (forgiveness), progenitor (forefather), pollution (defilement), audience (hearing, 'in the *audience* of the people'), matrix (womb), scribe (writer), infidel (unbeliever), vigilant (watchful), impotent (weak), mollified (softened), illuminated (enlightened), meditate (think), distil (drop), laud (praise). This list might easily be extended; and if we were to take in such terms as could be replaced by a short Saxon phrase, still more would be included. Moreover, there are many cases where a familiar word of classical origin might take the place of one less generally known. Such are—perdition (destruction), diversities (differences), inquisition (search), supplication (prayer), delectable (delightful), incensed (enraged), epistle (letter), and many others.

The introduction of learned terms is most open to objection, when the general style of the passage is in contrast to such language. Thus, in simple narrative or discourse, the use of such terms is out of place. In the introduction to John's Gospel, the clause, 'the darkness *comprehended* it not' is felt to be inharmonious; 'understood' would have fitted better into the marked simplicity of the passage. Such want of harmony is often noticeable in the language of poetry. 'The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my *progenitors* unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills'. Here 'progenitors' is decidedly out of unison with the rest; 'forefathers' would have suited perfectly.

The following are additional examples. 'There are *celestial* bodies and bodies *terrestrial*' would have been much simpler and equally accurate if rendered thus: 'There are heavenly bodies and earthly bodies.' 'The blessed and

only *potentate* (mighty one), king of kings, and lord of lords.' The Lord's Prayer could have been made purer Saxon: 'sins' and 'them that sin against us' might have been put for 'debts' and 'our debtors', 'free' for 'deliver', and 'might' for 'power'. If 'drawing aside' were used for 'temptation', and 'brightness' or 'praise' for 'glory', the whole would be Saxon; but these last changes would be more doubtful, as tending to sacrifice precision to simplicity.

Even in regard to the special or technical words that are needed to designate the peculiar institutions or ideas of religion, the Saxon element might have been farther drawn upon. Such good native terms as 'passover', 'sin', 'atonement', show how others might have been obtained from the same source. 'Everlasting' is more suggestive than 'eternal'; and, though both are made use of in the English Bible, the native word might alone have been sufficient. For 'resurrection', which to a mere English reader has no meaning till explained, the simple Saxon equivalent, 'rising', might have been employed.

It should be apparent from the previous illustrations, that there is nothing in the mere fact of a word's being Saxon (or from one of the indigenous dialects) to make it plain, homely, and expressive; and nothing in the mere fact of a word's being classical to make it want these qualities, or be discriminative, dignified, and oratorical. The contrast grows out of the whole of the incidents connected with the two classes of words; and, as these incidents vary, the contrast is lessened.

In truth, there is a scale of gradation in the recondite nature of our classical words. Some of them are as easy and homely as the commonest of the words inherited from our simple-minded Teutonic forefathers; while some of our Saxon words, by being sparingly used, or by being connected with difficult notions (as laws and government) may not be readily followed. 'Flower', 'gain', 'branch', 'gentle', 'terrible', are quite as familiar as the Saxon 'bloom', 'win', 'bough', 'mild', dreadful'; and 'riding' (a district),

'ordeal', 'wapentake', 'wardmote', 'gavelkind', though native, are not universally understood.

Among the easier classical importations are those that came in early from the French; they had the advantage of longer time to circulate; and they were less connected with the abstruseness of speculation. The words adopted from the Latin direct, since the revival of letters, and those from the Greek, are farther removed from common apprehension. Of two forms of the same original word, one through the French, the other direct from Latin, the French form is most familiar: 'reasonable', 'rational'; 'rule', 'regulation'; 'balm', 'balsam'; 'lesson', 'lection'; 'sure', 'secure'; 'power', 'potential'; 'judgment', 'judicial'; 'envious', 'invidious'.

We may therefore greatly simplify a learned style, without resolving it into the pure Saxon. From the Greek to the Latin, from the Latin to the French, we proceed in the direction of being more easily understood. Hence to simplify a difficult passage by the substitution of Saxon or, failing that, of easy classical terms, will form one of the best exercises in applying the pupil's knowledge of the sources of English. Examples will now be given.

'By a series of criminal enterprises, by the successes of guilty ambition, the liberties of Europe have been gradually extinguished: the subjugation of Holland, Switzerland, and the free towns of Germany has completed that catastrophe; and we are the only people in the eastern hemisphere who are in possession of equal laws and a free constitution'. May be turned thus (the words in italics are still of classical origin, while exemplifying the increase of simplicity as we pass from the unchanged Latin words to the French modifications):—'By one wicked undertaking after another, by the lucky hits of guilty strivings (yearnings, likings) the freedom of Europe has been (put out) taken away bit by bit; the beating (ending, *chastening*) of the free towns of Germany (has filled up that *misfortune*) has brought on the crash; and we are the only folk (*realm*, *common*wealth, king

dom), in the eastern half of the earth that have fair laws and free birthrights (*charters*)'.

The next sentence is more largely Saxon:—'Freedom, driven from every spot on the *continent*, has sought an *asylum* in a *country* which she always chose as her *favourite* abode.' It might have been pure Saxon; 'driven from every spot abroad, has sought shelter in a land that was always her chosen abode'.

'But she is pursued (followed, hunted, *chased*) even here, and threatened with destruction (rack and *ruin*) (her hunters threaten to 'put an end to' her). The inundation (flood) of lawless power (might) after sweeping over the whole earth threatens to follow us here, and we are most exactly (truly), most critically (nicely), placed, in the only aperture (opening) where it can be successfully repelled (thoroughly beaten back, dammed up), in the Thermopylæ of the universe (world)'. 'If liberty (freedom), after being extinguished (put out) on the continent (abroad), is suffered to expire (allowed to die out) with us, whence is it ever to emerge (rise up, awake) in the midst of that thick night that will invest (enwrap) it'?

While oratory loses in melodious flow and elevation by being pushed to the Saxon extreme, it does not lose in energy, but rather gains, as is proved by these sentences from Robert Hall. Moreover, in an oratorical address to the feelings, fine discrimination is not called for. The motive for passing out of the Saxon is to get more various topics of appeal and allusion.

The next extract is from De Quincey, and the Saxonized form is printed by the side of the original.

Yet still, it will be urged, the curiosity is not illiberal which would seek to ascertain the precise career through which Shakespeare ran.	Yet still, it will be said again, the wish is not mean that would seek to find out the true race (way) through which Shakespeare ran.
This we readily concede; and we are anxious ourselves to contribute anything in our	This we readily *allow* (give in to); and we greatly wish to bring forward anything we

power to the settlement of a point so obscure.

What we have wished to protest against is the spirit of partisanship in which this question has too generally been discussed.

For, whilst some, with a foolish affectation of plebeian sympathies, overwhelm us with the insipid commonplaces about birth and ancient descent, as honours containing nothing meritorious, and rush eagerly into an ostentatious exhibition of all the circumstances which favour the notion of a humble station and humble connections; others, with equal forgetfulness of true dignity, plead with the intemperance and partiality of a legal advocate for the pretensions of Shakespeare to the hereditary rank of gentleman.

can for the settlement of a thing so dark (little' understood).

What we have wished to speak out against is the feeling of onesidedness, in which this *question* has too often been talked about.

For, whilst some, with a foolish show of fellow-feeling with the folk, overwhelm us with old worn-out sayings about birth and coming of an old stock, as *honours* having in them nothing praiseworthy, and rush earnestly into a showy setting forth of all the things that make for the thought of (belief in) a low standing and low kinsmen; others, with as much forgetfulness of true worth, hold forth with the keenness and onesidedness of a law *pleader*, whatever seems to make out a right for Shakespeare to be reckoned a *gentle*man by birth.

The next extract, being on a classical subject, contains a number of unavoidable classical words.

There is yet another point of view in which it behoves us to take notice of the Council and the Agora as integral portions of the legendary government of the Grecian communities.

There is yet another way of looking at the thing, in which it behoves us to speak of the *Council* and the *Agora* as *parts* (bits) that helped to make up the whole *rule* [easier than 'government'] of the

We are thus enabled to trace the employment of public speaking as the standing engine of government and the proximate cause of obedience, to the social infancy of the nation.

The power of speech in the direction of public affairs becomes more and more obvious, developed, and irresistible, as we advance towards the culminating period of Grecian history—the century preceding the battle of Chæroneia.

That its development was greatest among the most enlightened sections of the Grecian name, and smallest among the more obtuse and stationary, is matter of notorious fact; and it is not less true, that the prevalence of this habit was one of the chief causes of the intellectual eminence of the nation generally.

At a time when all the countries around were plunged comparatively in mental torpor, there was no motive sufficiently present and powerful to multiply so wonder-

Grecian commonwealths in the tales.

We are thus *enabled to* (can by this means) follow speaking before (one's) fellow-townsmen as the standing means of *ruling* and the nearest *cause* of *obeying*, up to the childhood of the *people* (folk) as a body.

The might of speech for leading *in public* things comes more and more before us, becomes more fully unfolded, and beyond withstanding, as we go on towards the highest *age* of *Grecian story*—the hundred years before the fight of Chæroneia.

That its growth was greatest among the most enlightened of those bearing the *Grecian* name, and smallest among the more dull and un*changing* (standing still), is a well-known truth; and it is not less true that the *commonness* (wide spread) of this *habit* was one of the greatest things that made the *people* (folk) as a whole so high in understanding.

At a time when all the lands around, as likened to them, were sunk in sluggishness (deadness) of mind, there was no end to be reached that was near enough and strong

fully the productive minds of Greece, except such as arose from the rewards of public speaking.

The susceptibility of the multitude to this sort of guidance, their habit of requiring and enjoying the stimulus which it supplied, and the open discussion, combining regular forms with free opposition, of practical matters, political as well as judicial, are the creative causes which formed such conspicuous adepts in the art of persuasion.

enough to make the *fruitful* minds of Greece so wonderfully many, besides what arose from the rewards of speaking before others.

The readiness of the crowd to yield to this kind of leading, their way of needing and liking the spur that it gave, and the open *debating* of (word-strife as to) what should be done in the things of the *common*wealth as well as in law, bringing together *regular* ways of working with freedom of withstanding, are the *causes (powers)* at work that made men so skilled in *moving* their fellows (in getting their fellows to think and do as they wanted).

Another classical extract is subjoined.

Lêtô, pregnant with Apollo, and persecuted by the jealous Hêrê, could find no spot wherein to give birth to her offspring.

In vain did she address herself to numerous places in Greece, the Asiatic coast and the intermediate islands; all were terrified at the wrath of Hêrê, and refused to harbour her.

As a last resort, she ap-

Lêtô, big with Apollo, and followed with hate by the *jealous* Hêrê, could not find any spot wherein to give birth to her offspring.

She went to many *places* (spots) in Greece, the Asiatic shore, and the islands between these, but she got no shelter; all dreaded the wrath of Hêrê, and would not harbour her [or more exactly—'answered that they would not harbour her'].

As a last step she drew

proached the rejected and repulsive island of Dêlos, and promised that if shelter were granted to her in her forlorn condition, the island should become the chosen resort of Apollo as well as the site of his temple with its rich accompanying solemnities.

near to the slighted and forbidding island of Dêlos, and gave her word that if shelter were yielded her in her forlorn *state* (plight), the island should become the chosen abode of Apollo, as well as the seat of his *temple*, and its rich *solemnities* with it (the abode where Apollo would like best to dwell, and where the house of his worship would be set up with its rich hallowed shows).

Dêlos joyfully consented, but not without many apprehensions that the potent Apollo would despise her unworthiness, and not without exacting a formal oath from Lêtô—who was then admitted to the desired protection, and duly accomplished her long and painful labour.

Dêlos gladly gave what was asked (said yes), but not without many fears that the mighty Apollo would look down upon her unworthiness, and not without making Lêtô swear in so many words—(taking a *regular* oath from Lêtô)—who was then let into the asked-for shelter and fittingly went through her long and sore (hard) pains.

Though Diônê, Rhea, Themis, and Amphitritê came to soothe and succour her, yet Hêrê kept away the goddess presiding over childbirth, Eileithyia, and thus cruelly prolonged her pangs.

Though Diônê, Rhea, Themis, and Amphitritê came to soothe and help her, yet Hêrê kept away the goddess that watched over childbirth, Eileithyia, and thus unfeelingly lengthened her pangs.

At lengtlf Eileithyia came, and Apollo was born. Hardly had Apollo tasted, from the hands of Themis, the immortal food, nectar and ambrosia, when he burst at

At length Eileithyia came, and Apollo was born. Hardly had Apollo *tasted* (smacked), from the hands of Themis, the food of the never-dying, *nectar* and *ambrosia* [unchanged as

once his infant bands, and displayed himself in full divine form and strength, claiming his characteristic attributes of the bow and the harp, and his privileged function of announcing beforehand to mankind the designs of Zeus.

The promise made by Lêtô to Dêlos was faithfully performed: amidst the numberless other temples and groves which men provided for him, he ever preferred that island as his permanent residence, and there the Ionians with their wives and children, and all their 'bravery,' congregated periodically from their different cities to glorify him.

Dance and song and athletic contests adorned the solemnity, and the countless ships, wealth, and grace of the multitudinous Ionians had the air of an assembly of gods.

The Delian maidens, servants of Apollo, sang hymns to the glory of the god, as well as of Artemis and Lêtô, intermingled with adventures of foregone men and women, to the delight of the listening crowd.

really not English] when he burst at once his childish (baby) bands, and showed himself in the full shape and strength of a god, taking his badges, the bow and the harp, and his rightful work of making known beforehand to mankind the mind of Zeus.

The word given by Lêtô to Dêlos was truly fulfilled: amidst so many other worship-houses and groves that men made for him, he ever loved that island best as his settled abode, and there the Ionians, with their wives and children, and all their 'bravery,' came together at settled times, each from his own town, to give him praise.

Dance and song, and *trials* of strength (tussels) set forth the worship; and the *countless* ships, wealth, and *grace* of the many Ionians had the look of a meeting of the gods.

The Delian maidens, handmaids of Apollo, sang lays to the praise of the god, as well as of Artemis and Lêtô, mingled with things that had happened to foregone men and women, to the great gladdening (happiness) of the listening crowd (the crowd of listeners).

The following passages from Bunyan will show how paying attention to the sources of words may enable us to simplify the language even of a writer usually remarkable for great simplicity:—

'Now I saw in my dream that *Christian* and Hopeful forsook him, and kept their *distance* (kept away) before him; but one of them, looking back, saw three men following Mr. By-ends; and, behold, as they came up with him, he made them a very low *congée* (bow), and they also gave him a *compliment* (greeting). The men's names were Mr. Hold-the-world, Mr. *Money*-love, and Mr. *Save*-all; men that Mr. By-ends had been formerly *acquainted* with (had formerly known); for in their *minority* (youth) they were *school*-fellows, and taught by one Mr. Gripe-man, a *schoolmaster* (Sax. teacher—but not simpler) in Love-gain, which is a market-town in the *county* (Sax. shire—but not easier) of *Coveting* (Lusting), in the North. This *schoolmaster* taught them the *art* of getting, either by *violence* (*force*—classical, but older and simpler), *cozenage* (craft), flattery, lying, or by putting on a *guise* (show) of *religion* (holiness—holy living).'

'This *parlour* (room—sufficiently definite) is the heart of a man that was never *sanctified* (made holy—'hallowed' is not quite the meaning) by the sweet *grace* of the gospel. The dust is his *original* sin (birth-sin) and inward *corruptions* (defilements) that have defiled the whole man. He that began to sweep at the first is the law; but she that brought water, and did sprinkle it, is the gospel. . . . . Then, as thou sawest the *damsel* (maiden) lay the dust by sprinkling the room with water, so is sin *vanquished* and *subdued* (overcome and slain), and the soul made clean through the faith of the gospel, and *consequently* (therefore) fit for the King of *glory* to *inhabit* (dwell in)'.

I conclude with two passages where the alterations are not pushed much beyond what our habits would tolerate.

Elated with his past prosperity, as well as stimulated	Flushed (puffed up) with his late (bygone) good luck,

by his native courage, Harold resolved to give battle in person; and for that purpose he drew near to the Normans, who had removed their camp and fleet to Hastings, where they fixed their quarters.

He was so confident of success, that he sent a message to the duke, promising him a sum of money, if he would depart the kingdom without effusion of blood.

But his offer was rejected with disdain; and William, not to be behind his enemy in vaunting, sent him a message by some monks, requiring him either to resign the kingdom, or to hold it of him in fealty, or to submit their cause to the arbitration of the pope, or to fight him in single combat.

as well as pricked on by his inborn boldness (the boldness he was born with: 'fearlessness', being negative, could hardly 'prick him on'), Harold made up his mind to give fight at the head of his troops (showing himself in the field, to fight with his own hand, that he would himself fight); and for that end (therefore) he drew near to the Normans, who had taken away (flitted) their camp and ships to Hastings, where they took up their ground (set themselves up).

He believed so fully (had so strong belief, or trust) that he should win, that he sent word to the duke that he would give him a great deal (much wealth), if he would leave (go out of) the kingdom without the shedding of blood.

But his *offer* (bid) was thrown aside with scorn; and William, not to be behind with his foe in boasting, sent him word by some *monks* (holy men, men of God) that he must either yield up the kingdom, or hold the kingdom of him as his man, or leave it with the Head of the Church to say which of them had the better right, or fight him man to man.

Harold replied that the God of battles would soon be the arbiter of all their differences. (Hume.)

Harold answered that the God of fights would soon settle all the things that they were not at one upon.

The next is from De Quincey.

Still, with all this passion for being despised, which was so essential to my peace of mind, I found at times an altitude—a starry altitude—in the station of contempt for me assumed by my brother that nettled me.

Still, with all this (warm) wish to be scorned (looked down upon), which was so thoroughly needful to my (without which I could have no) peace of mind, I found at times a height—a starry height—in the *station* of scorn for me put on by my brother that nettled me.

Sometimes, indeed, the mere necessities of dispute carried me, before I was aware of my own imprudence, so far up the staircase of Babel, that my brother was shaken for a moment in the infinity of his contempt: and, before long, when my superiority in some bookish accomplishments displayed itself, by results which could not be entirely dissembled, mere foolish human nature forced me into some trifle of exultation at these retributory triumphs.

Sometimes, indeed, the bare needs of *dispute* (word-strife) bore me, before I was aware of my own want of wary foresight (unwisdom, unwariness, heedlessness), so far up the stair of Babel, that my brother was shaken for a twinkling (little time) in the boundlessness of his (in his endless) scorn: and, before long, when I showed myself better than him in some bookish knowledge, by *results* (an outcome) that could not wholly have another *face* put upon them (it), silly *human nature*, and nothing else, drove me into some trifle of boisterous (jumping, frisking,) gladness at these *victories* whereby I took *revenge* on him.

But more often I was disposed to grieve over them.

They tended to shake that solid foundation of utter despicableness upon which I relied so much for my freedom from anxiety.

But more often I was minded to sorrow over them.

They went to shake that strong groundwork of utter scorn (-ableness) upon which I leaned (to which I trusted) so much for my freedom from painful care.

COMPOSITION OF WORDS.

The simple words of the language—root words, as they are called—are formed into compounds, with new or modified meanings. This is done by joining to them significant syllables, called prefixes and endings or suffixes, according as their place is at the beginning or at the end.

The chief benefit of the compounding operation is to shorten the expression of meaning. For a 'person making a holiday tour' we say 'tourist'; the syllable *ist* containing the meaning of five words. A man 'that does not think well what he is doing' is described as 'thought*less*'. There are three poems of Wordsworth, entitled, 'Yarrow *un*visited', 'Yarrow visited', 'Yarrow *re*visited'; the small syllables 'un' and 're' being sufficient to express facts circumstantially different.

The number of significant syllables joined to words in this way is very considerable; and as one root word may be compounded with two, three, or even four such syllables, the words of the language may, by means of composition, be multiplied indefinitely.

Certain of the prefixes and endings are of Saxon origin. Others are of classical origin; these, however, do not all equally demand our attention for the purposes of English.

The great matter as regards Derivation is to be regular in the use of such compounding syllables as are significant. They should all have an understood meaning; we ought to

see what that meaning is, and, as far as possible, to keep by it. The faults, therefore, coming under Derivation, are, first, using prefixes and endings wrongly; and, secondly, using them without any meaning at all.

PREFIXES.

The Saxon Prefixes.

The full enumeration of Saxon prefixes reaches nearly thirty; there being several couples spelt alike, although different words originally—a, for, un.

The first a—abed, ablaze, aflame, aside—is a contracted adverbial phrase—'on bed', 'on blaze', &c.; it gives us a certain number of adverbs. Writers consider themselves at liberty to coin new examples; nevertheless, the whole number in general use is not very considerable.

In a few similar compounds, the 'a' has a different origin: as 'ge-' in '*a*ware', '*a*long (of)'; 'of' in '*a*shamed', '*a*thirst', &c. Such instances are of philological, not of practical, importance.

The second a, in 'arise', 'arouse', is one of the vague prefixes. Perhaps the only difference that we feel now between the simple word and the compound is that the compound gives a fuller sound, and may occasionally be thought more impressive. The prefix has descended to us in about half-a-dozen verbs, and does not enter into new formations. It is not worth while to detain pupils on a prefix that is so rare, undecided, and pithless.

After and **all** being in use as detached words, their meaning is apparent in composition, and is essentially kept up in the compounds; as '*after*thought', '*Al*mighty'. The compounds with 'after' are expressive condensations, and may be pointed out as such: 'after-crop' is the crop that comes after the first or chief crop of the year,—a second crop.

The preposition by as 'be' makes a few adverbial com-

binations—besides, before, betimes—which are hardly worth taking to pieces in ordinary parsing. The combination with verbs—become, bestir—has in numerous instances almost ceased to manifest a distinct meaning. The prefix operates to better purpose in combining with nouns (and a few adjectives) to form verbs: bedim, befriend, bewitch. It is used with both Saxon and classical roots.

In nouns, the form **by** is much more common than 'be'; we have 'belief', 'behest', but also—by-name, by-path, bystander, byword.

The preposition **in** (also **em, en**) is an extensively used prefix: and its meaning, as a primary fact of place, is apparent throughout.

For in 'forbid', 'forego', 'forswear', 'forbear', is an energetic negative; and, though it combines with a few classical roots, still more might have been made of it. The effect, however, is marred by confusion with 'fore', in 'foretell', 'forerun'; also, in its way, a useful prefix.

Forth has but two or three compounds: forthcoming, forthgoing, forthwith. Mr. Kington-Oliphant gives '*forth*ward' as the prior form of '*for*ward'.

Full, in the verb 'fulfil', is solitary; it has a few combinations with participles, 'full-blown', 'full-grown'. There is no restriction to such compounds; they express shortly an important circumstance, or else give intensity or emphasis to the action.

Gain implies 'against', opposition, in a very few examples: gainsay (compare *contradict*), gaingiving, gainstand, gainstrive. The first is the only compound in modern use.

Mis is one of the strong, marked, and decided Saxon prefixes; and might be selected as a prominent example in teaching derivation. It signifies, originally, separation; as seen in the verb 'miss', to deviate, or err, and thereby to lose, or cause failure; occurring in many habitual combinations with energetic meanings (misbehave, misdeed, misgive, misshape, misspell, misspend). It may be extended at our pleasure. It is not confined to Saxon words, being too valuable to be withheld from words generally; whence many

hybrid combinations—misapply, miscarry, misguide, misjudge, misrule, misstate.

The **n** (ne) in 'neither' 'never', 'naught' (shortened 'not'), 'nor', is a limited use of the great negative root, which is Saxon and Latin also. It is not the prevailing Saxon prefix of negation.

The correlative pair **off** and **on** are used but sparingly; and the meaning is in every case sufficiently obvious.

Out and **over** are in much more extensive employment, being found in nouns, in adjectives, and especially in verbs. The meaning, which is very often figurative, may always be readily felt and assigned. '*Over*live' (compare '*sur*vive') is found with the same sense as '*out*live'; but the meanings of compounds with the same root are usually quite distinct. These prefixes combine with classical as well as with Saxon roots.

Thorough usually exchanges the original meaning of place for the figurative sense of completeness: 'thoroughfare'; 'thoroughbred', 'thorough-going', 'thorough-paced'.

To in 'to-day', 'to-night', 'to-morrow', had a wider use in old English.

For the important fact of negation and opposition, our native prefix is **un**. Before nouns, adjectives, and participles, this syllable expresses pure contrariety: truth, untruth; wise, unwise; unrest, unthrift, unbelief; unfair, unseemly, unbearable; unending, unbroken, unannealed. Its utility is too signal to be confined to native roots. It is used at random with classical words: undisciplined, undischarged, unappeased; uncertain, uneasy, uncivil; unconcern, unreserve.

There is a way of using this prefix as a substitute for 'not', that is somewhat embarrassing. When we read, 'Surely that stream was *un*profaned by slaughters', we cannot parse 'was unprofaned' as a verb: there is no such verb. The 'un' is used in place of 'not' to give a negative meaning. So 'unprovided for', 'unaccounted for', 'unrelated to', are 'not provided for', &c.; which is the only way to parse such compounds.

Un with verbs—unsay, unpack, unloose, unscrew—has the

more special meaning of reversing the action of the simple verb. Brougham said, on one occasion, 'you cannot *unflog* a man'. If there were a verb 'unprofane', it would mean to undo or remedy a profanation that has already taken place. 'Un' has something in common with the still more powerful prefix (of Latin origin) 'dis'.

Prefixed to classical verbs, it gives rise to many hybrids: unarm, unchain, uncoil, uncover, undress, unfix.

Under, as a preposition of place, shows its meaning plainly in 'undergrowth', 'underhand', 'undersell'.

In 'undergo', 'undertake', 'understand', the sense is highly figurative; the two first may be illustrated by comparison with their Latin counterparts, 'subire', 'suscipere'.

Up is a well-marked preposition or adverb of place, and is apparent as such in its compounds, which are chiefly Saxon.

Wel, well, is used chiefly with participles or participial adjectives, and with nouns that contain the force of a verb: well-meant, well-bred, well-educated, welfare, well-being, well-wisher. It is joined with both native and classical roots.

With in 'withstand', 'withdraw', is Anglo-Saxon, with the meaning 'against', 'back'. It is confined to a few words, and cannot be extended. 'With', signifying companionship generally, is not used as a prefix, except for the compound prepositions 'within', 'without'.

The use of this survey of the properly English or native prefixes is to fasten the attention of pupils on the more important; by which means also they will better remember the less important. One great art of impressing the mind is to give *relief;* an even level of details flags upon the attention. Moreover, a prefix used in scores, if not hundreds, of words, is better worth considering than one that occurs only in two or three; and a marked and emphatic meaning is more worthy of being dwelt upon than a vague or wavering signification.

The Latin Prefixes.

Of these we have principally to consider such as are used by ourselves in forming new compounds. In regard to words that have descended to us as compounds, we may still pay attention to the prefixes (as well as the endings) if they give their meaning to the words. Thus 'extra' in 'extraneous', 'dis' in 'disjunction', 'circum' in 'circumvent', 'contra' in 'contrast', 'super' in 'supersede', 'surprise', 'sub' in 'submerge', 'suffix', 'suspect', have a distinct meaning, apparent in the compound. When a prefix or ending has no apparent effect on the signification of a word, we may pass it over entirely. Some words containing the prefix 'in' have scarcely any trace of its presence: as 'imbecile', 'immediate', 'immense', 'imprint', 'improve', 'infancy', 'insolent', 'integrity', 'intense'. Compare 're' in 'receive', 'recommend', 'rejoice', &c. As a rule, however, the prefixes continue sensibly to manifest their meaning along with the root.

Most of the Latin prefixes, like the Saxon, are the simple prepositions, which all signify direction. They, accordingly, impart to the action of the verb some special direction—as from, to, with, in, out of, between, above, beneath, through, beyond, away, beside. There are two that from direction have come to express Time—*ante* and *post*—'before' and 'after'. The literal meanings of all of them have, however, in the vast number of names, passed into metaphorical and secondary meanings, where we can still trace the operation of the original sense; as 'abstract', 'perceive', 'pretext', 'secret', 'submit' 'translate', 'derive', 'insinuate'.

The important meaning of negation or contrariety is represented, in the Latin group, by the very energetic syllable *dis*, by *contra*, *in*, *non*, and to some extent by *ob* (against), *re* (again, back), and *a*, *ab*, *abs* (away, from). The strong Saxon prefix, *mis*, is repeated from a Latin source (*minus*), but without the same intensity of meaning: as in 'mischief', 'mischance', 'misadventure', 'miscreant'.

The class of words with the prefix dis is large and increas-

ing; there is not the smallest scruple in using it with any verb, Saxon or classical, where the meaning may require it: disabuse, disallow, disappear, disappoint, disarm, disavow, disband, disbelieve, disclaim, discolour, disconcert, discount, discredit, disembark, disentangle, disenthral, disestablish, disfigure, disgrace, dishonour, disinherit, dislodge, disown, displace, displease, disprove, disrupt, dissemble, dissociate, distrust, disunite, disuse. The action of the verb in these cases is emphatically undone or reversed, producing the opposite condition, with positive consequences: 'Displease' is more serious than 'to fail to please', 'not to please', it is positively 'to give pain'; 'disprove' rises above 'unproven', and means positively to 'refute'. In combination with nouns and adjectives, too, the sense generally goes beyond mere separation or negation; as in discourtesy, distaste, difficulty, disagreeable, disreputable, diffident.

It is modified to **di**, in diminish, diverse, divest, divide, divorce, divulge, &c.; to **de** in defame, defer (put off), defy, delay, deluge, deploy, detach; to **des** in descant, descry, despatch. In most cases, the forms 'de' and 'des' are due to the influence of French.

Contra (against) gives the most literal expression of negation; 'contradict' is to say the exact opposite of what another has said; 'contra-indicate' (in medical language) is to indicate a contrary drug or application. For matters of truth and falsehood, for prepositions admitting affirmation or denial, the compounds of 'contra' are the most usual forms of opposition. As regards the state of belief, we say 'disbelieve', 'disprove'; as regards mere affirmation we say 'contradict', 'controvert', 'maintain the contrary'.

The form **contra** is not very frequent; 'contro' is seen in 'controvert' and its derivatives. The greater part of the compounds exhibit the French form 'counter': counteract, counterbalance, countermand, counterpart, countersign, counter-evidence.

The useful syllable **in** is marred by ambiguity; having two origins with different significations. 'In', the preposition of place, will be treated of later. The other 'in',

with which we are concerned here, is the negative particle, corresponding to the English 'un', not: inactive, incapable, incomparable, inconsolable, incorrect, incredible, indefensible, indelible, indocile, infallible, infinite, injudicious, insane; inaction, inexperience. It changes into 'il', im', 'ir', to suit or to assimilate with the adjoining letter of the root: illegal, illicit, illiterate; immortal, impartial, improvident; irregular, irreligion, irrevocable. In many words of Latin origin, the English 'un' is preferred (compare p. 233): uncertain, undue, unextended, unfamiliar, ungracious, unimpassioned, unmanageable, unofficial, unparliamentary, &c. Compare the varieties—'inapt' and 'unapt', 'incapable' and 'uncapable' (Shak.), 'incertitude' and 'uncertainty', 'incivility' and 'uncivil', 'inextinguishable' and 'unextinguishable', 'injustice' and 'unjust', 'inequality' and 'unequal', 'immeasurable' and 'unmeasurable', 'unmeasured'.

Non occurs more frequently in English, than in Latin, or even in French, compounds. It is joined to roots of whatever origin: nonage, nonconformist, nonentity, nonjuror, nonsuit; non-appearance, non-compliance, non-fulfilment, non-elastic (compare '*in*elastic'), non-political, non-professional, (compare '*un*professional'), non-resident, non-Hellenic.

The Latin **ne**, like the Teutonic 'ne', is rare. The few words where it occurs were compounded before leaving Latin: nefarious, negative, negligent, negotiate, nescience, neutral.

Ob (by assimilation, **oc, of, op**) proceeds from the earlier meanings of 'towards', 'in front of', to the sense of 'opposition'. The limited number of compounds where it has the signification of 'against' were formed in Latin; and in a considerable proportion of these, the force of the preposition is far from distinct, being merged with the meaning of the root. The practical value of the prefix is depreciated by its not being used for new compounds. Examples: object, obloquy, obstacle, obstinate, obstruct, obtrude; occult, occur; offend; oppose.

'*O*mit' and '*o*stensible' show modifications of the prefix. For Re in its negative meaning, see below.

A, ab, abs, 'away from', trenches upon the meaning of negation. It indicates change of position that goes more or less in the direction of opposition, a greater or less departure from the original action or state: *a*vert, *ab*normal, *ab*use, *abs*ent, *abs*tain.

'*Ad*vance', *ad*vantage', disguise the prefix. They are malformations from French *avancer*, *avantage*, from *avant* (= *ab* + ante).

The syllable re (again, back) plays a great part in the composition of words. Sometimes it simply repeats the operation, as rebuild, re-admit, re-open, re-animate, readjust, restore, renew, revisit, re-enter, re-write; in other names, it means 'to go back', by which meaning it approaches to negation or opposition; react, rebel, refrain, reluctance, renounce, repel, reply, resist, retaliate, retire, retort, retrace, retreat, revolt.

This last meaning is still more decidedly shown in the compound prefix retro (backwards): 'retroflex', 'retrofract', 'retrograde', 'retrovert'; 'rear', 'rearguard', 'rear-admiral'.

The form red appears for 're' in a few words, whose roots begin with a vowel: redeem, redintegration, redolent, redound, redundant.

The prefix 're' seems at first glance somewhat obscured in the shortened or contracted words 'rest' and 'remnant'. It is hidden under French influence in 'rally', 'ransom', 'render', and perhaps 'rent' (payment, income).

While ante states simple priority of time, as in 'antedate', pre is used for the same purpose more frequently and emphatically, and also with other metaphorical extensions: pre-Adamite, prehellenic, predispose, predecease, precognosce, precngage, predetermine, premature, preordain, preoccupy, prevision (compare '*fore*sight'), prewarn (compare '*fore*warn'); present, pretend; precede, prefer, preeminent; prescribe, precept—are a few examples of a very

expressive combination. In 'preach' and 'provost', the disguise is French.

In the primary sense of place, both prefixes are rare, 'ante' being perhaps the oftener used of the two: antecedent, antechamber, anteroom.

'Anticipate' spells *anti*—before leaving the Latin. French influence has modified the prfiex in 'ancestor and 'ancient'.

Post, 'after', is chiefly used for the meaning of time: postscript, postdate, postpone, post-diluvian.

No less valuable than 'pre' is the prefix (from the Latin *cum*, 'with') **com, con, co**; which enters into many words of classical origin with a felt meaning, and is often joined to words for the first time by ourselves. The circumstance that two or more objects accompany one another or go together, is exceedingly frequent, and very important. To state this shortly, and yet clearly, is one of the first requisites of any language that aspires to express the order of nature and the relations of human life. Our native vocabulary would be found unequal to so great a task. Our preposition 'with' in composition means 'against'; and there has been hardly any attempt to overpower the usage, by forcing the other meaning; our old 'mid' (= with) remains only in *midwife*. In expressing the sympathetic, social, or companionable feelings and habits, Saxon is very poor; 'fellow-feeling' goes only a very little way. Still worse off are we in attempting to set forth all the relations of concurrence among external things, as given by the classical compounds—co-exist, co-extensive, coincide, coinhere, contemporary, contiguous. The persons of the Trinity have to be described as 'co-equal' and 'co-eternal'. De Quincey uses the phrase 'co-present to the view'. We have also 'co-membership', &c.

Roots beginning with **l** and **r** usually modify the prefix into **col, cor**:—collateral, colleague, collocate, collision; correct, correlate, correspond, corrode.

In some words the prefix is more or less obscured, chiefly

through French influence: cost, couch, counsel, count (verb and title), covenant, cover, curry, custom.

The pupils should occasionally parse words of this class, and give the equivalent of the prefix in some other form—'co-exist', exist together, at the same time and place; 'co-inhere', inhere in the same thing; 'co-eternal', eternal in company; 'collect', to gather together into one body, to bring to the same place; 'co-operate', work together, in harmony, for a common object, lending mutual help.

In, the preposition of place, appears (through French influence) also as **en, em**, and (by assimilation) as **il, im, ir**: '*in*cage' and '*en*cage', '*in*quire' and '*en*quire', *en*act, endure, envoy; *em*bark, embrace; *in*cite, indwelling, inroad, install; *ill*uminate, illusion, illustrate; *im*bibe, immure, impoverish; *ir*radiate, irrigate, irruption. Not unfrequently the force of the prefix is but faintly felt. (See p. 234.)

'Ambush' and 'anoint' contain the prefix greatly modified.

The fuller form **intro** is always decided: *intro*duce, intromission, introspection.

Inter means 'between', 'among'; it is used for new compounds. *Inter*cept, interchange, interleave, intermarry, international, interrelations.

The French modification **entre** influences a few words: 'enterprise', 'entertain', and (more remotely) 'enter'.

The meaning opposite to 'in, intro, inter', is given by '**ex, e, extra**', 'out of, from, without'. Various applications are exemplified in the following series: exhale, exhaust, exhibit (compare '*dis*play'), exalt, extol, expand, extend, exhilarate, expect, execute, exonerate (compare '*dis*burden', '*un*burden'); enormous, excessive, exorbitant (compare under 'extra'); emerge.

'Ex' is reduced to 'e':—egress, eject, elect, elegant, elevate, emaciate, emerge, erase, evade. By assimilation, 'ex' becomes **ef**:—effacc, effect, effort, effusion. There are many disguised compounds, the influence being mainly French: —*a*fraid, *a*mend, *a*stonish, *e*scape, escheat, essay, *i*ssue; *s*ample, *s*carce, *s*corch, *s*courge, *s*tandard.

None of our words in common use are new formations by help of 'ex': apparent instances are found already compounded in Low Latin or in French. The only living usage is the case where we prefix 'ex' to an official title to denote that the person designated has ceased to hold the office: *ex*-emperor, ex-king, ex-provost, ex-secretary. Compare the Latin forms: *ex*-advocatus, ex-consularis, ex-consul(e), ex-quaestor(e).

Extra is 'outside of, beyond': extraneous, extraordinary, extravagant, extravasate, extra-mural, extra-parochial, extra pay, extra work. In the figurative sense of addition or excess compare (under 'ex') 'enormous', 'exceed', 'exorbitant'; also 'preternatural'. In 'strange', and in 'stray' (?), the prefix is concealed under the French mask.

Preter, 'besides, beyond, more than', is used chiefly in 'pretermit', 'preternatural' (compare 'extra'), and a few designations in technical grammar.

Ad, 'to', enters into a large number of compounds. By assimilation, it takes on various forms. *Ad*apt, adore, adhere, adjoin, admire, *ac*cent, accept, accord, *ac*quaint, acquire, *af*fect, affirm, *ag*grandise, aggrieve, *al*lege, allow, *an*nex, annoy, annul, *ap*pend, approach, *ar*rest, arrive, *as*sail, assert, assimilate, *at*tain, attend. Frequently the 'd' is omitted: *a*base, achieve, agree, ascribe, aspire, astringent, avail, avenge, aver, avouch, avow; in many such instances French influence is plainly visible. 'Add' is nearly all prefix.

We cannot undertake to mark off a clear division between the Saxon 'a' (on) and the French 'à' (ad). Mr. Earle says that 'in the bulk' they are 'to be identified', 'and even in the alterations from the Saxon, this French preposition has been influential'. (Phil. of Engl. Tongue, § 606 b, p. 566, 2nd edition.) Mätzner gives 'aneak' (= à pic), 'apart' (= à part), 'apace' (= à pas), 'apiece' (= to the share of each), 'afront' (= in front), 'agog' (in a state of desire = à gogo).

To those already given may be added: adieu, adroit, affair, amass, amerce, amount.

Ambi, amb, am, an, 'both, round about', takes no part in new formations. It is found already joined to a few words: *ambi*dexter, *ambi*ent, ambiguous, ambition, per*amb*ulate, *amp*utate, *anc*ipital.

Bi, bis, bini, 'twice, double, two by two', is radically connected with 'dis, di'. The form 'bi' is used extensively in technical compounds: *bi*angular, bilateral, binomial, bicarbonate, bisulphate, bivalve, bisect, bifurcation, biped, bilingual. 'Bis' is rare: *bis*cuit, bissextile. 'Bini' is seen in *bin*ary, binocle, binocular, binous—all which also may be regarded as technical.

Semi and **demi** (Fr.), 'half', are used with a uniform sense in many new compounds.

Circum, 'around, round about', is largely employed. It is sometimes literal, sometimes figurative, always readily understood: *circum*ference, circumnavigate, circumspect, circumstance, circumvent. 'Circu' appears in '*circu*it'.

De, 'down, from, away', occurs in many compounds:—*de*pend, depress, descend, destined; deter, detract, detain, deviate. Hence the idea of negation, opposition, removal: deform, demoralize, deprecate, depreciate, derange, destroy, desuetude, detect, dethrone; there are new technical or scientific formations, as—decarbonize, deodorize, deoxydate. Often the prefix is more or less intensive, if not entirely in abeyance: decadence, deflagrate, demur, deplore, deprive, derelict, deserve, desolate, devoid.

It has been already pointed out (under 'dis') that many words beginning with 'de' are compounds not of 'de' but of 'dis'. The transforming influence was French.

Per means 'through, thoroughly, completely': percolate, perforate, permeate, perpetual, persist; perfect, persuade. The idea of wrongness or badness allies itself with the following: perfidy, perish, perjure, pervert.

Technical or scientific compounds are—percarburet, peroxide, persulphate, &c.

In 'peradventure', 'perchance', the governing preposition coalesces with the noun.

There is one case of assimilation—'*pel*lucid'.

French influence is apparent in 'pardon'; 'appurtenance' is a corruption.

Pro, 'forth, forward, before': produce, profuse, promise, protract, provoke; progress, promote, prosecute; protect, provide.

Under French influence, it becomes 'por' and 'pur':—portend, portrait, portray; purchase, purloin, purpose, pursue, purvey.

The idea of *substitution* appears in 'pronoun'; in official titles—proconsul, prodictator, &c., and the 'pro-proctor' of the English Universities (compare under 'vice' and 'sub'); and in scientific names—proembryo, prothallus, prothorax.

'Proctor' (procurator) and 'prompt' are contractions.

Pene, 'almost', is employed only twice or thrice.

Sub, 'under', 'from under', inferiority, substitution: very extensively used in new compounds. *Sub*aqueous, subdue, subject, subjoin, submarine, subordinate, subtract: *sub*-committee, sub-kingdom, sublet; subacid (moderately, slightly acid), subastringent; substitute, sub-dean (compare 'vice', 'pro'), sub-editor, suffice; *sub*sequent ('after'), succeed.

In adaptability to the forms that it compounds with, 'sub' rivals 'ad': *succour*, *suffer*, *suggest*, *summon*, *suppress*, *surreptitious*, *suspect*, *sustain*.

Obscure cases are—sojourn, sudden.

The longer form of the prefix—**subter**—is represented chiefly by 'subterfuge'.

Super gives the opposite meaning, 'above', 'over', excess, superiority. It enters into new compounds: *super*structure, superimpose, superincumbent, superadd, superabound, superfine, superior.

The form 'sur' is due to French influence: *sur*charge, surface, surfeit, surpass, surplice, surprise, surrender, survey, survive.

The derived form 'supra' is used in several new words, chiefly technical: supracretaceous, supramundane, suprarenal.

Trans, 'across', through: *trans*fer, transgress, transition, transmit, transport, transmarine, transverse, trance.

A few words modify the prefix to 'tra': *tra*dition, traduce, traverse, travesty. Under French influence are *tres*pass, traitor, treacherous, treason.

Ultra, 'beyond', excess, is not in frequent use: *ultra*ism, ultramarine, ultramontane, ultra-sentimental. It is not firmly distinguished from 'trans' in 'ultramarine' and 'ultramontane'; but 'trans' could not take its place in such instances as 'ultra-liberal'.

'Outrage' is a French modification.

The Latin adverbs **bene**, well, **male**, ill, appear in a few compounds, and are occasionally used in fresh instances; 'Mal-administration' is a companion to 'mis-government'. 'mal-practice', 'mal-content', are thought to give energetic meanings. Other examples of 'male': malediction, malefactor, malevolent; maladjustment, malarrangement, malformation, malversation. 'Bene' is less common: benediction, benefactor, benefice, beneficial, benefit.

Vice for substitution, is adapted to the common situation where one person or thing has to take the place of another; vicar, vice-admiral, vice-chairman, vice-consul, vicegerent, vice-president, vice-regal, viceroy, viscount. Compare (under 'pro') the official title 'proconsul', &c.

Se, sed, in 'secede', 'sedition', 'segregate', 'separate', condenses a circumstance of not unfrequent occurrence. The number of words is not great; but they are very often wanted. Farther examples: seclude, secret, seduce, select, sever. **Sine** occurs in 'sinecure'.

The Greek Prefixes.

For our purpose, it would be unprofitable to marshal these in the detail accorded to the Latin prefixes. Very few of them have a living application to form new compounds. Not only have the most of our Greek compounds been formed before reaching us; but the greater part of our Greek vocabulary, which is not very extensive, may be described as learned or technical. It will be sufficient, then, to confine our attention to a few of the more active prefixes.

Anti, 'against', has come down to us as part of a few words, and it is freely used by us for new compounds. It enables us to express in short compass a frequent and important meaning. *Anti*dote, antiseptic, antibigotry, antidogmatic, anti-Sabbatarian.

Arch, 'ruling', 'chief', expresses in an emphatic condensation the meaning of eminence or superiority, whether good or bad. In the new compounds the bad sense is almost exclusively preponderant. *Arch*angel, archbishop, archdeacon; *arch*-conspirator, arch-enemy, arch-fiend, arch-traitor.

Auto, 'self', occurs in a few common words—authentic, autobiography, autocrat, autograph, autonomy. But generally it is passed over in favour of then ative 'self': self-abasement, self-command, self-educated, self-seeking, and many others.

Dia, 'through', is found in a large number of compounds, chiefly technical: diabolic, diadem, diagnosis, diagonal, diagram, diamagnetic, diastole, diathermal, diatonic.

Dys, 'evil' or badness, and **eu**, 'well', goodness, occur in a few examples: dysentery, dyspeptic; eulogy, eupeptic, euphony.

Hyper, 'above', over, beyond, excess, and **hypo**, 'under', beneath, inferiority or deficiency, are employed in several compounds in common use, but chiefly in technical names. Hyperbole, hypercritic, hypertrophy; hypochondria, hypocrisy, hypothesis, hypochlorous, hypophosphorous, hyposulphurous (acid). Compare under Lat. prefix 'sub'.

Mon, mono, 'alone', enters into many compounds. *Mon*arch, *mono*cotyledon, monogram, monologue, monomania, monopoly, monothalamous, monotone. Hence also 'monastery', 'monk'.

Pan, 'panto', means 'all', 'everything'. *Pan*acea, pandemonium, panegyric, panhellenic, panoply, panorama; *panto*mime.

Para, 'beside', **peri**, 'around', 'about', and **poly**, 'many', occur in a good many compounds, mostly technical. The last, 'poly', is the most common.

Pseudo, 'false', spurious, deceptive: pseudonym, pseudo-

morphous, pseudo-apostle, pseudo-martyr, pseudo-philosopher. New compounds are freely permitted.

Syn, 'with', together: *syn*agogue, synclinal, synod, synonym, syntax. There are various modifications: *sy*stem, *sy*stole, *sy*style; *syl*lable, syllogism; *sym*bol, symmetry, sympathy, symphony. This contributes towards expressing the important meaning described under the Latin prefix 'con'.

SUFFIXES OR ENDINGS.

Of these, we have an extensive assortment both native, and borrowed. Many of them express meanings that are also given by prefixes: as, for example, the Saxon suffix of negation—'less', fearless. Compare 'unmerciful' with 'merci*less*', '*sub*globular' with 'round*ish*', '*en*crust' with 'harden'.

The Saxon Suffixes.

It is not intended to give here an exhaustive enumeration of the native suffixes. Our purpose will be sufficiently served if we attend mainly to such as still exercise an active influence, and in a less degree to such as may present any noteworthy peculiarity. Many endings whose meaning is obscurely felt or sufficiently obvious will thus be passed over unnoticed. The order adopted is as nearly alphabetical as is convenient.

Ard, art, heart, (O. E. heard, hard; O. Fr. ard), originally indicated possession of the root meaning in a high degree; but this intensive signification has generally been more or less softened or obscured. The influence of French is marked upon nearly every compound; many of them, indeed, are French formations. Occasionally a bad sense attaches to the compound.

From nouns—buzz*ard*, coward, haggard, sluggard, staggard; from verbs—bragg*art*, drunkard, laggard, niggard, pollard, petard, poniard, standard; from adjectives—dullard, sweet*heart*, wizard. National and personal names:

Savoyard, Spaniard; Leonard, Richard. 'Gizzard' (Fr. gésier) is an assimilated form; and so, perhaps, are one or two others.

Craft was added to a few nouns to express strength, skill, art, and hence also the province where the quality was displayed: book*craft*, leechcraft, priestcraft, witchcraft, woodcraft. In some of the words, as 'priestcraft', 'witchcraft', the doings of priests, witches, &c., brought discredit on the suffix.

Dom sets out with the meaning of dignity, power, authority, jurisdiction; and hence expresses significantly a state or condition, and a collective whole. It unites very extensively with nouns: king*dom*, dukedom, earldom, heathendom, martyrdom, serfdom, thraldom; beadledom, boredom, puzzledom, Saxondom, &c. 'Wisdom' and 'freedom' are from adjectives.

Ed or **d** is the well-known ending of the perfect participle of weak verbs: plant*ed*, prove*d*. It can still be discerned in a few nouns, as—blood, flood, deed, seed; and in a few adjectives, as—cold, dead, naked. Often the participle is used as an adjective: '*loved* friends', 'long *looked-for* day', 'the *conquered* territory', '*pent-up* energy'.

Perhaps the most interesting case is where 'ed' is added to a noun to form an adjective with the meaning of possession. This formation has been strongly objected to; more particularly in the person of the word 'talented'. No doubt we are unable to draw a decisive boundary line between this adjective and the participial adjective. Antlered, bearded, diseased, feathered, flowered, rooted (traditions), striped (waistcoats), whiskered (Pandoors), and such like, may possibly be claimed as participles. Yet, after the most liberal allowance, we should have difficulty in not recognising that many of the following examples are in the same predicament as 'talented'; formed from nouns, they express a participial meaning—'endowed and furnished with, possessing': bigoted, cadenced wisdom (E. W. Gosse's Poems), capitalled farmers, certificated teachers, bladed corn, daisied fields (George Eliot), daisied turf (Aytoun and John Wilson),

experienced, gifted, landed property (estates, &c.), leisured persons, moneyed, murrained cattle (Shelley), nectared sweets (Symonds), patterned, sainted (compare 'saintly'), salaried members, skilled, spirited, storied urn (Gray), tolled roads, unexampled, unfriended (Goldsmith), unidea-ed, wooded'. There seems to be a decided tendency to accept this formation in practice. Compare also, under t (p. 269), 'cornute', &c. (See also Latham's Johnson's Dictionary, under 'gifted'.)

When an adjective is linked to the noun, the noun takes on 'ed' with the utmost readiness. 'Hundred-handed', 'long-legged', 'middle-aged', 'old-fashioned', 'thick-headed', and similar cases, occur with extraordinary frequency.

Another form of 'd' is th, t. We need not concern ourselves with concrete derivatives, like 'dart, earth, heath, knight'; nor delay over the adjective use of the participle in the form 't', 'a snapt ring'. The main importance attaches to the abstract nouns, which are formed partly from verbs, partly from adjectives. Birth, death, growth, mirth, ruth, spilth, stealth, tilth, draught, drought, flight, gift, might, sight, thought, weight. Breadth, dearth, depth, height (formerly also 'heighth', in Milton 'highth'), length, truth, warmth, wealth, width.

En, n, is the ending of the perfect participle of the strong verbs. This participle also is used as an adjective: 'a *beaten* army', '*broken* vows'; 'open, drunken, own', and one or two other regular adjectives were originally participles. Here again we may pass over a number of nouns, mostly concrete, formed in this ending, but very seldom with a felt meaning.

By means of 'en', adjectives are freely formed, for the most part, from nouns of material. aspen, beechen, birchen, brazen, cedarn, flaxen, golden, hempen, leaden, oaken, silken, twiggen, wheaten, wooden. Compare with these adjectives the substitution of the bare noun—'*silk* dress'; and also the forms in 'y' (when they exist)—brassy, silky, woody.

Er-n appears in 'eastern, northern, southern, western'.

And along with 'ern' may be mentioned **er-ly**: easterly, &c.

In causative verbs, **en** is an important suffix to adjectives, and occasionally to nouns. Chasten, deepen, broaden, fatten, gladden, shorten, sicken, slacken, sweeten, widen. Hasten, heighten, lengthen, strengthen.

Of the adjectives, nouns, and verbs, forming in **l, el, le**, we notice only the verbs. These have a diminutive and frequentative sense: dibble, drizzle, dwindle, fribble, frizzle, giggle, sprinkle; which easily passes over to depreciation: babble, cackle, dabble, dangle, wrangle. (Compare 'r', 'er', immediately following.)

Of words ending in **r, er**, we again pass over those where the suffix is no longer more than a dead termination; a very few adjectives, a few frequentative or intensive verbs, a considerable list of nouns. The living interest attaches mainly to names of personal agents derived from verbs: baker, builder, driver, fisher, leader, lover, player, speaker. A smaller, but increasing, number come from nouns: forester, glover, hatter, hedger, miller, outfitter, waggoner. We cannot in every case assert decisively whether the root is verb or noun: ditcher, gardener. There are also many names of things (some of which are used also for persons), both from verbs and from nouns: bruiser, chopper, cleaver, cooler, cracker, cutter, grinder, layer, (twelve)-pounder, refresher, slaver, steamer, streamer, sucker, weeper. This is one of our most active endings, attaching itself to classical as well as to native roots. ..

Naturally the Saxon **er** gets confused with another 'er' or 'ier' from classical sources. Hence—brazier, clothier, collier, glazier, sawyer. We find also—li*ar*, begg*ar*, sail*or* (O. E. sail*er*), &c. But the most noticeable cases are nouns that appear to be formed by adding 'er' to verbs or to other nouns: archer, barber, cellarer, draper, falconer, mariner, officer, palmer, prisoner, treasurer. Yet these, and many others, are really from a Latin termination, *-arius, -erius*, modified into French, *-aire, ier*. Perhaps the formation of names of personal agents from nouns in 'er' received an impulse from the similarity of such examples.

Er and **est**, the comparative and superlative suffixes, are explained under the Inflection of Adjectives. With these is to be classed the double superlative ending '-most' (O. E. *mest*) in—hindmost, lowermost, utmost, westmost, &c.

Fold is used freely to form adjectives of number: threefold, sevenfold, sixtyfold, manifold. These are useful in carrying on the multiplicative series—single, double, triple (treble), &c.

Ful is of great account as an adjective suffix, joined to nouns native and classical alike: artful, baleful, careful, dutiful, fruitful, manful, powerful, reproachful, sinful, thankful, useful, wasteful, woeful. We can seldom be sure that it unites with a verb: forgetful, wakeful, (perhaps) fretful.

'Ful' is also joined to nouns to form other nouns expressing a measure or quantity: bellyful, capful, handful, houseful, kettleful, toothful.

Hood, head, passes through the meanings of person, character, office, condition, state. It forms abstract nouns, which not unfrequently take a collective sense: brother*hood*, childhood, knighthood, manhood, neighbourhood, priesthood, widowhood, womanhood; god*head*, maidenhead (as well as 'maiden*hood*'). These are from nouns; the adjective roots are few—falsehood, hardihood, likelihood.

'Livelihood' should mean 'liveliness'. It is, however, an assimilation of 'liflode' (Saxon 'lifladu', = course or leading of life), 'means of living, maintenance'.

In the older stages of the language this suffix was in much more extensive employment. A few examples may be quoted: 'prentishode' (apprentice*ship*), 'efenhâd' (even*ness*, equal*ity*), 'lowlihood' (lowli*ness*), 'goodleyhede', 'bountihed' (boun*ty*, bountiful*ness*, bounteous*ness*), 'dreryhedd', 'humblehede' (humil*ity*), 'yonghede' (you*th*).

The corresponding form in German, *-heit*, is most abundantly used.

Ish, sh, ch, signifies in general 'belonging to or appertaining to' the idea of the root, 'resemblance' (after the manner of). Ap*ish*, babyish, bookish, churlish, foolish, monkish,

roguish, swinish—are from nouns. So also national names (adjective): English, Babylonish, French, Scottish and Scotch, Swedish; a form used much more freely by the Germans. Joined with adjectives, 'ish' indicates approach to the quality expressed by the root, the root quality in a weak or inferior degree: brownish, greenish, longish, oldish, reddish, sweetish. Compare the more technical prefix 'sub'—'*sub*acid', &c.

The sense of diminution or inferiority also runs through 'ock, (i)kin, ing, ling', which may be treated all together.

Ock is used mainly as diminutive: bullock, buttock, hillock, paddock, ruddock; and in some proper names: 'Pollock' (Paul), 'Simcox' (Simon), 'Wilcock, Wilcox', (William), &c. In some words the 'ock' ending is probably an assimilation.

Scotch presents some varieties; as in lass*ock*, lass*ick*, lass*ickie*, wif*ukie*, mann*ikie*. The ie in these last examples may be the separate ending 'y', 'ie', superadded to make a stronger double diminutive—Bill*y*, Tomm*y*; lassie, wifie, doggie, &c.

Kin appears in some words: bumpkin, buskin, daughterkin (Carlyle's Translation of Musæus's Dumb Love), ladkin, lambkin, &c.

Ing is found in a small number of instances, chiefly in names of persons, animals, and coins. Lord*ing* (which had not originally the diminutive signification), hilding, nithing; gelding, herring, whiting; farthing, shilling. 'Pending' was a prior form of 'penny'.

This '-ing' was the formative of the Saxon patronymic: as 'Ælfred Æthelwulfing', Alfred the son of Æthelwulf; 'Æthelwulf wæs Ecgbryhting', Æthelwulf was son of Ecgbryht. (Earle, Phil. of Engl. Tongue, p. 299.)

Here may be placed 'Ætheling' and 'King' (cyning).

Ling is the previous form with 'l' prefixed. It is a greater favourite than 'ing'. Joined to various parts of speech, chiefly nouns and verbs, it names for the most part persons and animals, rarely condescending to lower individuals. The sense of 'diminution' easily passed over to depreciation

and contempt (as sometimes was the case with 'ing'); still, in the names of animals especially, the suffix often indicates merely 'youth' or 'small size'. The following are examples of 'ling' in combination with various roots: duckling, gosling, lordling, nestling, oakling, sapling, seedling, stripling, twinling, yearling; darling, firstling, weakling, youngling; changeling, fosterling, foundling, hireling, nursling, suckling, yeanling; underling (compare O. E. 'overling' = ruler, master).

Ing, anciently *ung*, the native termination for verbal abstract nouns, is an ending of far greater consequence. Though marred by collision with so many other 'ing' endings, it is nevertheless used most widely. It joins with the utmost freedom to classical as well as to native verbs. Beginning, binding, blessing, building, clothing, dying, ending, fighting, giving, shipping, wandering; acting, carrying, charging, diminishing, glorying, performing, praying, prophesying, refreshing, reviving.

This suffix is found in many common nouns, and not unfrequently with collective meaning, as 'shipping'; but such cases are to be regarded as secondary applications.

Ling also turns up once more, this time as an adverbial termination, with a second form 'long'. The roots are adjectives and nouns: darkling, flatling; headlong, sidelong. The examples were at one time more numerous —backling, noseling, &c. And they still flourish in Scotch and in German.

Less is an exceedingly useful suffix for the negative or privative signification. It forms adjectives, mostly from nouns, which are native or classical indiscriminately: beardless, bootless, endless, eyeless, fearless, headless, lifeless, homeless, pithless; artless, defenceless, flameless, measureless, noiseless, pitiless, powerless, senseless, useless. The suffix is freely applicable in similar new formations. The compounds with verbs are few: exhaustless, quenchless, reckless, relentless, resistless, and probably countless, corruptless, moveless, viewless. These should be compared with the equivalent meanings in *in*exhaust*ible*, *un*quench-

able, *unrelenting*, *irresistible*, *incorruptible*, *immovable*, *invisible*. Such instances as—careless, contentless, excuseless, harmless, helpless, hopeless, repulseless,—are doubtful: 'repulse', for example, is both verb and noun, and though we may think that here it is probably the verb, we cannot be quite sure.

Ly is a modification of 'like'. Both are adjective suffixes, added chiefly to nouns and adjectives. 'Ly' is very much more common than 'like'; and though in most cases they have the same force, they sometimes take slightly different shades of meaning when joined to the same root. The general sense conveyed by the suffix is likeness, conformity, congruity, belonging to: child*like*, gentlemanlike and gentlemanly, godlike (compare 'godly'), ladylike, lordlike (compare 'lordly'), cowardly, fatherly, fleshly, friendly, heavenly, kingly and kinglike, lovely, motherly, rascally. worldly. The distributives—daily, nightly, weekly, monthly, quarterly, yearly, &c., may be originally adverbs, now used also as adjectives. 'Ly', added to an adjective, means approach to the idea expressed by the root, the idea in weakness, inferiority, dilution (compare 'ish'), or as an inclination or tendency: cleanly, deadly, elderly, goodly, lonely, lowly, only, sickly, weakly. The word 'likely' itself is a curious case. We have also 'inly', 'overly', which were accompanied in Saxon by 'uply', 'outly', &c.

Ly, the ordinary suffix for deriving adverbs of manner or quality from adjectives, needs little illustration. The examples are numberless: fairly, carefully, wickedly, worthlessly. The process is extended to participles: boastingly, deprecatingly, disapprovingly, exultingly, invitingly, provokingly; admittedly, avowedly, confessedly, confusedly, dejectedly. Such adverbial conversion of the participle is a powerful means of condensation. (See pp. 132, 135.)

The activity of this 'ly' hinders in some degree the development of the adjective ending 'ly', especially the formation from adjectives. To compensate for this, some

adverbs in 'ly' are used with the force of adjectives—weekly, nightly, &c. But adjectives in 'ly' are not to be used as adverbs; an error that writers sometimes inadvertently fall into.

The two uses of 'ly' render some words ambiguous. Thus, 'earthly', 'heavenly', may mean—like the earth, 'grovelling', like heaven, 'a heavenly scene'—or they may mean place of residence, 'earthly parents', 'heavenly father'. In 'daily', 'weekly', the 'ly' adds no meaning to the noun: 'daily bread' might be 'day bread'. In the Lord's prayer, we might have—'Give us this day the day's bread, the bread of the day': 'daily' in ordinary use is 'day by day', 'each or every day'.

The adverbial ending meal (originally '-mealum', a dative) is now represented by the almost solitary 'piecemeal'.

Older writers have 'flockmel', 'limbmeal' (Shak. Cymb.), 'stoundemele' (from hour to hour, moment by moment; Germ. *Stunde*, 'hour').

Ness is one of our most prolific suffixes. It is used almost exclusively to form abstract nouns from adjectives. It joins on to adjectives of whatever origin, native or classical, with the utmost readiness, expressing usually a state or condition: brightness, fatness, friendliness, goodness, hardness, illness, readiness, usefulness, sinlessness, suitableness, troublesomeness, unreservedness, voluptuousness. Sometimes 'ness' interchanges with some classical suffix: compare such instances as 'effeminate*ness*' and 'effemina*cy*'. 'Nothingness' is a bold irregularity. 'Wilderness' is concrete in meaning.

Ow, a termination chiefly (in the first instance) of nouns and adjectives, has been developed from various old endings: u (v), wa or (e)we (ve), (i)g, or h. Meadow (mead*u*), shadow (scad*u*), fallow (feal*u*, feal*we*—Lat. ful*vus*), callow, narrow, shallow (adj.), yellow, mallow (mal*u*, Lat. mal*va*), sparrow, swallow; bellows (bealg), borrow, farrow (fear*h*), follow, hallow, hollow, marrow, sallow (noun), willow. 'Sinew' and 'borough' might have been expected to take 'ow'. 'Widow', 'window', and some others, are merely

assimilated forms. The suffix '-ow' is no longer of practical importance with a view to new formations.

Red, reckoning, numbering, design, condition or state, (compare Germ. *Rath*, 'counsel'), is now unimportant. It occurs in the two words 'hatred', 'kindred' (= '*kinship*', thence collectively = 'kin'). Perhaps 'hundred' might be added, with the explanation of 'ten-reckoning' (10 × 10). In the older language there existed a few more: 'sibrede' (relation*ship*, affin*ity*), 'frendrede' (friend*ship*), 'manrede' (vassal*age*) neyeburredde' (neighbour*hood*).

Ric, 'power, dominion, jurisdiction', has also had its boundaries seriously contracted. It now remains only in 'bishopric'.

Ship, 'shape, form, manner', is one of the vigorous suffixes. It is most frequently connected with nouns, especially class names of persons, to indicate 'quality or condition, occupation or office, rank or dignity': apprenticeship, authorship, chieftainship, consulship, editorship, fellowship, friendship, generalship, lordship, ownership, professorship, workmanship. 'Worship' is 'worthship'; 'courtship' may be from the verb ('the act of courting'). 'Hardship', 'drunkschipe' (Gower), are from adjectives.

'Land*scape*' (earlier 'landskip') is a well preserved form of the suffix, with an older meaning. According to Mr. Earle, we got it from the Dutch artists, 'Landschap'.

The form '-schaft' is most extensively used in German: 'gesell*schaft*', 'companion*ship*' (society).

Some occurs frequently as an adjective ending. It is joined to various parts of speech, adding to the root the meaning of 'likeness, inclination, suitableness'. With adjectives: blithesome, darksome, gladsome, lonesome, wearisome, wholesome; with nouns: delightsome, handsome, heartsome; with verbs: irksome, meddlesome, winsome, noisome (O. Fr. noisir = nuire), buxom, (bugan, to bend; slightly diguised). Many others, though probably from verbs, may possibly come from nouns: gamesome, laboursome, quarrelsome, toilsome, troublesome.

Ster, the fem. suffix, is discussed under the Gender of

Nouns. In modern usage, 'spinster' alone is a purely feminine compound. The others, for the most part, if not in every instance, were originally feminine, corresponding to masculines in 'er(e)'; they are now either masculine or common: bandster (dialectic), deemster, dryster, gamester, huckster, maltster, punster, rhymester, songster, tapster. In some instances there is a depreciatory or contemptuous force, which has attached to the suffix from some of the vile roots that it has allied itself with. Often 'ster' seems to be little more than a variety of 'er' denoting the agent.

Ward conveys the meaning of motion in some direction, usually 'in the direction of' something. It is joined chiefly to adverbs, and to nouns that are mere remnants of adverbial phrases. It thus helps to make new adverbs; and also adjectives, some of which are but converted adverbs. In many of the adverbs, there is a second form 'wards', which may appear in the preposition '*toward*, *towards*'; the additional adverbial *s* is a genitive ending: backward(s), downward(s), eastward(s), outward(s), toward(s), upward(s), wayward. Not unfrequently the preposition opened up, like a rhizopod, to take in the governed word: '*to* me *ward*', 'to God ward', 'from Bordeaux ward', '*to* us *ward*', *to* the wind*ward*'. Compare Lat. '*ad* Oceanum *versus*' (to Ocean-ward). Hence such decayed adverbial expressions as—churchward(s), heavenward, homeward(s), landward, lee-ward, seaward(s), skyward.

Wise, ways, 'manner, mode, way', coalesces with adjectives or nouns to make adverbs: likewise, nowise or noways, otherwise; lengthwise or lengthways, sideways or sidewise.

The Saxon adjective 'riht*wis*' is transformed to '*right*eous', under the assimilating influence of the classical ending. Dr. Morris gives also '*boisterous* (O. E. *bostwys*)'.

Y, sometimes **ey**, has for its chief function the converting of nouns, especially material and abstract, into adjectives. It is used most liberally with both native and classical roots: bloody, boggy, bony, dusty, finny, hilly, mealy, moody, snowy, speedy, spicy; clay*ey*, purs*ey* (from 'purse': distinguish 'pursy'), sky*ey*; balmy, faulty, flowery, fruity,

juicy, papery, savoury. Formations from verbs may be quoted with more or less probability: bandy (legs), blowy, cranky, doughty, drowsy, shaky, showy, sweepy, wavy, wieldy: some of these, as 'showy', 'wavy', may be from nouns.

It may be noted that this termination represents more than one older form. Most of the instances are from a prior *ig*, *eg*: 'guilty' (gylt*ig*), 'misty' (mist*ig*), 'moody' (môd*eg*), 'fenny' (fenn*eg*, *-ig*). A few stand for *iht* (which still flourishes in German): hairy, stony, thorny, &c. Of course, new examples are without reference to these older forms.

The Classical Suffixes.

The Classical suffixes in English are exceedingly numerous. Some of them have come down to us from Greek and Latin with little or no modification; others, in passing through French, have been changed to such a degree that we have difficulty in recognising them; and a few have quite dropped away. In many cases the French form has been passed over in favour of the older Latin form. It will be enough for us to notice such as are still active in new formations, and such as at any rate impart a decided meaning to the root; we may also now and again touch on other notable instances. But we desire to encroach as little as possible on Latin Etymology.

Ade is mostly collective, sometimes abstract, while a few words have both meanings: balustrade, barricade, blockade, cannonade, cascade, cavalcade, colonnade, fusilade, lemonade, orangeade, parade, promenade, salad, serenade, tirade.

Age is a very important suffix, joining with both native and classical roots. It forms nouns, abstract, collective, common. There are verbal abstracts—cartage, coinage, marriage, passage, tillage; and abstracts from nouns, expressing quality, condition, or rank—baronetage, bondage, courage, peerage, vassalage. The collective meaning is perhaps the most common—assemblage, baggage, carnage, cellarage, cordage, foliage, herbage, luggage, plumage;

with which may be classed a few that name cost, charge, and price—brokerage, keelage, mileage, porterage, postage, &c. Some of these remind us of the verbal abstract meaning. The common nouns are not numerous: cottage, hermitage, vicarage, village, &c.

Al is one of the most prolific suffixes. It is found in adjectives and in nouns. In adjectives it represents various Latin suffixes, usually *alis;* and it is freely added to nouns to form new adjectives. It simply furnishes the noun with an adjective form. (Pp. 93, 274.) Annual (cp. 'yearly'), capital, celestial (cp. 'heavenly'), criminal, equal, fatal (cp. 'deadly'), general, imperial, literal, mortal, natural, official, pictorial, potential, prodigal, real, royal, spiritual, supernal, vernal. New formations: antipodal, agricultural, architectural, conventual, musical, papal, postal, additional, educational, exceptional, intentional, professional, sensational, traditional (cp. 'tradition*ary*'), departmental, governmental, monumental (cp. 'document*ary*').

Many such adjectives are used as nouns, and sometimes the adjective meaning has even been lost: capital, cardinal, criminal, festival, general, hospital, journal, material, official, ritual.

The formation of abstract nouns from verbs by 'al' is a brisk process: acquittal, approval, arrival, committal, (cp. 'commit*ment*', 'commiss*ion*'), denial, derival (cp. 'deriv*ation*'), dismissal (cp. 'dismiss*ion*'), disposal (cp. 'dis-'posit*ion*'), requital, reversal (cp. 'revers*ion*'), revisal (cp. 'revis*ion*'), revival, survival, upheaval, withdrawal.

The suffix 'al' attaches itself willingly to adjectives in '-ic': angelical, biblical, biographical, comical, farcical, historical, lackadaisical, monarchical, whimsical. In some cases the adjective stripped of 'al' is not in use.

An, ain, ane, ean, ian, are for the most part adjective endings; the last is the most common.

An, ain form adjectives, and also nouns (some of which are converted adjectives): artizan, dean, human, pagan, publican, veteran, Tuscan, Elizabethan; captain and chieftain,

certain, chaplain, fountain, villain, Britain, Spain. **Ane** appears in humane, mundane, ultramontane, &c.

Both **ean** and **ian** make adjectives with the vague sense of 'relating to' the root meaning; they occur in adjectival names of nations, parties, sects, &c. European, Pythagorean, cerulean, adamantean; Arabian, Persian, Christian, Baconian, Georgian, Tennysonian, diluvian, pretorian. 'Ian' is very frequent, not only in adjectives but also in class names expressing occupation, rank, &c.: historian, librarian, magician, musician, physician, tragedian'.

The Greek **arch, archy**, are found in a few words denoting government or rule. (Cp. the prefix 'arch'.) Hierarch-y, monarch-y, oligarch-y. 'Squirearchy' is new.

The same meaning is given by **cracy**. On the model of the Greek 'aristocracy, ochlocracy, &c.', we have formed 'bureaucracy', 'mobocracy' (with insertion of 'o'), &c.

Ary is in frequent use as a suffix in adjectives and in nouns.' Many of the nouns are converted adjectives. The meaning is 'belonging to'; and the nouns denote persons or places occupied with or sharing in what the root expresses. The adjectives are nearly all from noun roots, and many of them are new: hereditary, imaginary, mercenary, military, pecuniary, salutary, temporary, tributary, tumultuary, voluntary; customary, reactionary (cf. 'al'—'tradition*al*'), revolutionary, sanitary, complimentary (cf. 'al'—'monument*al*'), fragmentary, parliamentary, rudimentary, &c. &c.; seldom from other adjectives or from verbs: necessary, primary, secondary, solitary; sedentary. Nouns come chiefly from other nouns, also from adjectives and verbs: aviary, boundary, dictionary, dignitary, functionary, granary, lectionary, missionary, penitentiary, reliquary, salary, sectary, vocabulary; sanctuary, secretary; commissary, depositary (cp. 'depos*itory*'), dispensary, notary, votary.

Although some Latin adjectives in *aris* appear in English with 'ary', many take the shorter ending 'ar': 'angular, polar, popular, regular, similar, singular, vermicular, vulgar. The sense is vague—'relating to'.

A large class of verbs in **ate** are formed from the supine

of the Latin verb of the first conjugation, or on a similar plan by appending 'ate' to a root (noun or adj.) with the desired meaning: captivate, create, devastate, emasculate, enervate, expatriate, indurate, migrate, navigate, permeate, renovate. For adjectives and nouns in 'ate', see p. 269.

A smaller number in -it-ate, (from, and in imitation of, the Latin frequentatives in *-itare*) mostly give a causative sense, while the idea of repetition is often weak or absent. Agitate, palpitate, hesitate, debilitate (cp. 'weaken'), facilitate, necessitate, nobilitate (cp. 'ennoble'), rehabilitate'.

Ble, able, ible, is an adjective suffix, attached for the most part to verbs. The union of it with nouns is owing in great measure to French influence. The Latin adjectives in 'bilis' were sometimes active, sometimes passive, occasionally both. In the multitudinous English compounds, the passive sense is the prevailing one; and this should be remembered in making new examples. The ending is added to the root or to the supine of the verb. The following instances have the passive signification 'able to be', 'that may or can be': appreciable, bearable, comeatable, demonstrable, eatable and edible, estimable, habitable, indomitable, indispensable, memorable, moveable and mobile, practicable, resoluble and resolvable, tolerable, venerable; corrodible and corrosible, discernible, flexible, incorrigible, intelligible, ostensible, plausible, sensible. Sometimes the idea of ease and readiness is superadded: excitable, flexible, irritable. The transition to the active or middle sense is not difficult; 'variable' is often the same as 'varying', 'mutable, changeable' = frequently or readily 'changing'. The secondary meanings are often more prominent than the original: advisable, amicable, considerable, culpable, equable, feeble (O. Fr. floible, foible, Lat. flebilis), miserable, noble, remarkable.

The instances from nouns are capriciously active or passive, and somewhat destitute of principle in formation, the original force of the suffix being seemingly in abeyance. Conscionable (according to conscience), customable (cf. 'customary'), dutiable (that duty has to be paid on, may be imposed

on), fashionable, favourable (showing favour or goodwill), forcible, marketable, marriageable (fit for market, or for marriage), objectionable, exceptionable (that objection or exception may be taken to), peaceable, personable, profitable (yielding profit), seasonable, serviceable, statutable, valuable.

Special notice is to be taken of such examples as 'reliable', which has been made the scapegoat for the whole class. Instead of 'that may be relied *upon*', it should mean 'that may be relied': the word should be 'rely-*upon*-able' (cp. 'come*at*able', p. 259). Probably there are others of the same sort: 'laughable' is for 'laugh-*at*-able' (or is it 'causing a laugh'?), 'unaccountable' for 'unaccount-*for*-able', 'debateable' (border) perhaps for 'debate-*about*-able', 'conversable' (person) for 'converse-*with*-able' (or is it = 'ready to converse'?), 'available' for 'avail-*oneself-of*-able' (or is it active = 'availing'? cp. 'profitable').

A 'responsible' person is a person 'that *replies*' or (more strongly) 'that *has* to reply, is *bound* to reply'; 'accountable', 'accounting', or 'bound to account'; 'answerable' means 'that may be answered', also (= 'responsible'), 'bound to answer', and 'answering, responding'. So 'payable' is 'that ought to, has to, must, be paid' (passive).

'Risible' is not 'that laughs' or 'is to be laughed (at)', but 'causing or concerned in laughter'. 'Agreeable', 'suitable', 'terrible', are active. 'Feeble' has been mentioned. 'Humble' belongs to this suffix only in form; it is from 'humilis', with 'b' euphonic.

For nouns in **ble, cle**, see under '**ule**'.

Cy, (rarely) **sy**, joins by preference with roots in '**t**', usually rejecting the '**t**': it takes the place of Latin *tia*, *tus*, or forms new words on the model of these. In forming abstract nouns from adjectives, it is like '**ness**', with which it occasionally interchanges: degeneracy (degenerate*ness*), intestacy, intimacy, intricacy (intricate*ness*), obstinacy, secrecy. Joined to nouns, it expresses state or condition, office, rank (cp. '**ship**', &c.), and sometimes the meaning becomes collective: bankruptcy, chaplaincy, colonelcy,

cornetcy, curacy, ensigncy, episcopacy, idiocy and idiotcy, magistracy, minstrelsy, papacy, prelacy, primacy.

For ancy, ency, see under 'nt'.

From Greek *sis* are—ecstacy, epilepsy, frenzy, idiosyncrasy, palsy.

Ee (Fr. ée, Lat. atus) is in active use, especially as a business term, to denote the person that is the object of an action, the person that originates the action being expressed by 'or', 'er'. Thus we have couples: consigner, consignee; employer, employee; grantor, -er, grantee; legator, legatee; pawner, pawnee; payer, payee; vendor, vendee. In 'devotee, grandee', the ending seems to add force. 'Refugee' is assimilated. 'Committee' is collective. 'Absentee, patentee' name the *subject* of the action.

It has been already stated (p. 248) that, in class names of persons, the classical er and the native er cannot be rigidly discriminated, the English termination being readily added to classical roots. And classical examples were given.

From the same Latin ending arius, erius, we have received through French many words in eer, ier, expressing agency, occupation, &c.; and there are many new formations. Brigadier, cavalier, circuiteer, engineer, financier, gazetteer, mountaineer, muleteer, musketeer, mutineer, pioneer, privateer, scrutineer, volunteer.

Ese, 'of, belonging to', is used in some proper names, nouns and adjectives: Chinese, Japanese, Maltese; Johnsonese, Carlylese.

Esque, originally and chiefly an adjective suffix, denotes likeness, 'after the manner of': burlesque, grotesque, moresque, picturesque, romanesque, statuesque.

Ess and the Latin ix are discussed under the Gender of Nouns. New formations in 'ess' are common, but often unnecessary; the use of 'ix' is limited.

Of the words ending in et, the most important for us are the diminutives. These are somewhat numerous: billet, cabinet, coronet, lancet, locket, mallet, pocket, turret. Some are scientific names—carburet, sulphuret, &c. A few

take the form 'ot':—ballot, chariot, faggot, parrot; and some proper names—Wilmot, Charlotte, &c.

Let (l-et) also is a productive form:—booklet, branchlet, lakelet, leaflet, ringlet, speechlet, streamlet, troutlet.

Fy is a verbal suffix, which comes to us from the Latin through French, with the signification 'to make or cause'. It is added to adjectives or to nouns: clarify (Latin clar*ificare*, French clar*ifier*), deify, edify, fortify (cp. 'strengthen'), justify, magnify (cp. '*en*large'), modify, mortify (cp. 'dead*en*'), mystify, purify (cp. 'cleans*e*'), putrefy, qualify, rectify, sanctify, tipsify (Thackeray).

Ic, 'of, belonging to', merely imparts the adjective form: caustic, Celtic, generic, mystic, public, rustic', and many others. Sometimes 'atic' appears: aquatic, asthmatic, fanatic, Hanseatic, lunatic, problematic, systematic. We have already (p. 257) noted that 'ic' frequently takes on the further adjective ending 'al': canonical, clerical, cynical, fanatical, fantastical, majestical, problematical, prosaical, &c.

A large number in '-ic' have become nouns, especially to name arts, sciences, classes of persons: arithmetic, logic, mathematics, music, physics; catholic, cleric, cynic, domestic, fanatic, lunatic.

The French form **ique** is more rare: comique, critique, unique.

Ice, ise, ess, occur in some nouns originally and still mainly abstract, denoting 'condition or quality of' the root adjective or noun. They hardly appear in new formations: avarice, cowardice, distress, franchise, justice, largess, mermerchandise, malice, prowess, riches (French richesse).

Even less important for us are—apprentice, chalice, coppice, crevice, hospice, lattice, novice, precipice, prejudice, pumice, service, surplice, and suchlike—derived from various other original endings, whose special force is now mostly exhausted.

Many Latin adjectives are formed in **idus** from verbs and some from nouns. These (and a few others) are found in English in **-id**. The meaning is said to have been inten-

sive, 'abounding in, full of'; but, if so, it seems to have been much softened: acid, acrid, candid, placid, liquid, lurid, morbid, rigid, splendid, vivid.

Of other adjectives in '-id', the chief are new technical formations from Greek εἰδής (ides)—'like': alkaloid, amygdaloid (almond-shaped), chloroid, coralloid, mastoid, ovoid, typhoid. Some of these take 'al' also: amygdaloidal, coralloidal, ovoidal.

The most noteworthy words in il, ile, are adjectives. In some of them, the ending (Latin ilis) denotes merely 'belonging to' or 'congruity with'; in others, the original 'ilis' is a shorter form of 'bilis', expressing capability or suitableness passively. Civil, gentile (genteel, gentle), hostile, juvenile, servile; ductile, facile, fertile, fissile, flexile (cp. flexible, pliable), fragile (cp. breakable, refragable, refrangible), missile. Some of these become nouns: exile, juvenile, missile, utensil. Able, gentle, humble, stable, subtle, are contractions.

Many adjectives and nouns end in in, ine, (Latin inus, inus).

The adjectives, which are of most importance, are formed chiefly from nouns, the suffix expressing 'manner, nature, belonging to': Alpine, clandestine, coralline, divine (cp. godly), elephantine, feline, feminine, labyrinthine, marine (sea), porcine (cp. swinish), saccharine (cp. sugary), saline (salt). 'Sanguine' is Latin 'sanguineus'.

Many of the nouns have, at one time or other, been formed by conversion from adjectives: divine, intestine, libertine, Philistine, Sabine; discipline, doctrine, famine, medicine; javelin, Latin, matin, vermin. In 'origin, virgin', the suffix is Latin *-inem*. 'Engine' is Latin 'ingenium'.

Scientific names of materials are occasionally formed in this ending: butyrine, casein(e), elain(e) or oleine, legumin(e).

By means of ise, ize, verbs were formed from nouns and adjectives. The sense is 'to make, cause, give'. The suffix, originally Greek, is fully adopted into English. Cauterize, civilize, crystallize, deodorize, epitomize, fertilize, fraternize,

generalize, humanize, moralize, naturalize, oxydize, pulverize, realize, subsidize, temporize, tyrannize.

Ish is a verbal suffix, a modification from '-iss-' (= Latin -esc, -isc) in French verbs in 'ir'. The original inceptive meaning was dropped long ago. Examples are: abolish, accomplish, blandish, cherish, demolish, embellish, establish, furnish, languish, nourish, polish, replenish. Assimilated cases are—admonish, astonish, diminish, distinguish, extinguish, famish, publish, relinquish.

Even the form esce, in the few words where it occurs, has dropped the inchoative sense: acquiesce, coalesce, deliquesce, effervesce, efflorescc. The participial forms from 'esco' are in more common use, as adjectives: convalescent, crescent, evanescent, quiescent.

Ism (Greek) is used as a noun suffix, not only with verb roots as originally ('baptism'), but also with nouns and adjectives. It is freely used in new compounds to express state, condition, or action, or a system of principles or doctrines, or adherence to these: sometimes the meaning is concrete. Absenteeism, altruism, animism, Calvinism, despotism, journalism, organism, patriotism, pugilism; Conservatism (short for 'Conservativism'), conventionalism, empiricism, Fenianism, optimism, pessimism, radicalism, romanticism, secularism, truism, witticism, workingmanism. Occasionally censure or reproach is implied: babyism, ego(t)ism, mannerism, papism, pietism. Idiomatic ways of expression are denoted by 'ism': 'provincialism, purism, solecism, vulgarism; Americanism, Gallicism, Grecism, Irishism.

Many of the corresponding personal names are given by ist (Greek), which is also used where there is no connected form in 'ism'. It is thus very extensively used to name persons occupied with any art, trade, profession, science, or attached to any party or principles. Anarchist, anatomist, botanist, chartist, druggist, elocutionist, excursionist, Jansenist, journalist, latinist, materialist, monarchist, novelist, philologist (cp. philologer), physicist, physiologist, pianist, punctuationist (Earle), requisitionist, revolutionist, ritualist,

romancist (cp. romancer), tobacconist, tolerationist (Masson), tourist; absolutist, naturalist, purist, rationalist, royalist, separatist, specialist.

National or party names are expressed also in **ite**: Cananite, Israelite, Jacobite, Jesuit, Stagirite, &c.

Ite is common in new technical formations in science: braunite, millerite, sulphite, websterite, &c.

See also under 't'.

Contrasted with the passive 'ble' is the suffix **ive**, which in the vast majority of cases gives the active meaning. It is attached, sometimes to the root, generally to the supine of the verb. Abusive (= abusing), attentive (= attending), conservative (= conserving), corrosive (cp. corrodent), cursive (cp. current, running), destructive, elucidative, excessive, imaginative, offensive, penetrative, purgative; coercive, combative, forgetive, talkative. Compare 'productive' and 'conducive'.

The passive sense appears, not often as in 'ble', but usually as in the perfect participle passive. Captive (cp. caitiff), collective, derivative (active also), prepositive and post-positive (adjective—an adj. 'placed before or after'), relative, 'the *elective* branch of the Legislature' (Macaulay). 'Native' seems passive to begin with. Furtive, instinctive, &c. are from nouns; 'belonging to theft', hence 'stolen', passive meaning, &c. These departures from the predominating active sense should not be encouraged in new compounds.

Lent, an adjective suffix, joined mostly to nouns, means 'full of, loaded with, possessing the quality of the root in a high degree': corpulent, esculent, opulent, somnolent, truculent, turbulent, violent. Between the suffix and the root there is a connecting letter, 'u' or 'o'. New formations hardly occur.

Lence (rarely **lency**) is the termination of the corresponding abstract noun: corpulence, &c.

Ment is most abundantly prevalent as a suffix whereby abstract nouns are formed from verbs. It lends its services to classical and native roots with equal readiness: agree-

ment, bereavement, enchantment, endowment, establishment, fulfilment, imprisonment, movement, punishment, statement. Most abstracts may be employed also as concretes, but the abstract sense is not present in the use of the following: department (cp. departure), filament, fragment, garment, ligament, ornament, segment.

Nt, ant, ent, are active participial forms used as adjectives: arrogant, brilliant, consonant, constant, dormant, elegant, protuberant, valiant; confident, dependent, eminent, excellent, indolent, latent, lucent, patient, potent, provident, urgent. Some of these are converted into nouns, of which there are many besides: brilliant, dependant, descendant, inhabitant, mendicant, pendant, servant; accident, adherent, agent, current, gradient, ingredient, patient, president, regent, student, torrent.

The corresponding suffixes for abstract nouns, **ance, ence,** have second forms, **ancy, ency.** The first forms are the predominant ones, though sometimes only the last occur. A few words take both forms. Class names are exceptional. Abundance, brilliancy (-ance), consequence, constancy, eminence and eminency, entrance, excellence and excellency, exigency (-ence), experience, fragrance, ignorance, infancy, innocence (-ency), occurrence, precedence and -ency, preeminence and -ency, urgency. New verbal abstract nouns are abundant: admittance (cp. admission), appearance, forbearance, hindrance, repentance, &c.

On, eon, oon, ion (sion, tion), is a widely used suffix, corresponding to Latin -onem. The most important formations are the verbal abstract nouns, a countless multitude. Many that were originally abstract are used by us only as concrete class nouns. The influence of French is often very apparent. Action, composition, confession, decussation, degradation, expulsion, fusion, incremation, mission, oblivion, oppression, passion, rebellion, restitution, revolution, revulsion, station; advowson, arson, reason, treason; faction, fashion, legion, lesson, nation, oration, region. 'Custom, ransom', have experienced various vicissitudes since they were Lat. 'consuetudinem, redemptionem'.

The rémaining cases, consisting of class names, are of less consequence. Centurion, champion, felon, glutton, mason, simpleton, &c.—persons occupied or concerned with an action or a thing; Briton, Gascon, Saxon—national names. Also—capon, dragon, falcon, pigeon, salmon, stallion; dungeon, escutcheon, puncheon, truncheon. The form 'oon' is applied chiefly in names of things, now diminutive, now augmentative, now apparently giving the mere noun form: buffoon, dragoon, poltroon; balloon, harpoon, musketoon, pantaloon, saloon, spittoon.

Or (sor, tor), a frequent suffix, was originally added to the supine to express the agent: ancestor, author, confessor, creditor, debtor, expositor, impostor, predecessor, possessor, successor, testator. It was often added to other roots, or the root was shortened; while many words, not connected with Lat. '-or', assumed this ending. Conqueror, emperor, governor, grantor, juror, tailor, tutor; bachelor, chancellor (Fr. chancelier, Lat. cancellarius), counsellor, proprietor (Fr. propriétaire), sailor (O. E. sailer), warrior (Fr. guerrier).

The English 'er' has frequently usurped the place of Lat. 'or': compiler, diviner, founder, interpreter, labourer, preacher'. (See 'er', p. 261.)

Or, our (Lat. or, Fr. eur), expresses state, condition, quality, (result of the) action: ardour, clamour, colour, error, favour (favor), honour, liquor, splendour, stupor. It has been proposed that we should undo the French influence by writing all these words in 'or', never in 'our'. This proposal has been advocated with most warmth in America.

Ory (sory, tory) forms adjectives from supines. The sense is active; 'ive' may be compared. Amatory (cp. amat*ive*), compulsory (and compuls*ive*), compurgatory, congratulatory, consolatory, explanatory, expletory (and expletive), explicatory (and explicative), hortatory, objurgatory, obligatory, peremptory, predatory, prohibitory (and prohibitive), promissory, rotatory, satisfactory (satisfying), sensory (sensitive), suasory (persuasive). Some of these are new,

having no corresponding Latin adjective. The active sense should be maintained in all new formations: 'statutory' (like 'statutable'), from a noun, is practically passive; compare also 'furtive, &c.', under 'ive'.

The nouns in the same ending denote variously the result, place, &c., of the action: dormitory, history, memory, oratory, purgatory, refectory, repository.

Ous, ose (Lat. osus, Fr. eux, oux, &c.), 'full of, like, belonging to', represents various Latin endings—osus, us, is, &c. There are many compounds, old and new, from various parts of speech. Amorous (Lat. amor*osus*, Fr. amour*eux*), calamitous, curious, fabulous, glorious, hideous, monstrous, nervous, numerous, precious, spiritous and spirituous, sumptuous, victorious; jealous (Lat. zel*osus*, Fr. jal*oux*); anomalous (Gr. -ος, Lat. -us), barbarous, conspicuous (Lat. -us), contiguous, credulous, erroneous, industrious, obvious, spurious; illustrious (Lat.—is), scurrilous. Contradictious, disputatious, felicitous, joyous, murderous, precipitous, rapturous, timorous, treacherous, wondrous—are newer formations. We have 'ous' also in alliance with other endings: audacious, capacious, vivacious; atrocious, ferocious; avaricious, capricious, malicious; auriferous, carboniferous, fossiliferous, frugiferous, saliniferous; armigerous, cornigerous, plumigerous; carbonaceous, micaceous, papaveraceous, pearlaceous.

Ose is not common: bellicose, jocose, operose, otiose, varicose, verbose, vermiculose (and -ous); glucose, schistose.

Ery, ry, is joined to nouns, sometimes to verbs. It indicates condition, rank, characteristic action: bigotry, chivalry, devilry, husbandry, outlawry, pedantry, revelry, rivalry, slavery; the practice of an art or a trade, and sometimes also the materials—blazonry, cookery, drapery, fishery, heraldry, hosiery, poetry, surgery; the place where any activity is expended, or where the individuals denoted in the root are found numerously—bakery, cocoonery, grapery, Jewry, nunnery, nursery, pantry, vestry, vinery; or a collection—artillery, cavalry, Englishry, foppery, imagery,

infantry, machinery, masonry, musketry, peasantry, poultry, soldiery and citizenry (Carlyle), tenantry.

The Latin perfect participle passive gives rise to a very large number of adjectives, in t, ate, ete, ite, ute, which are now used with more or less slender reference to their original sense. All the conjugations are represented. Corrupt, discreet, elect, erect, extinct, perfect, rapt, secret, strict; considerate (act. cp. thoughtful), desolate, effeminate (cp. womanish), inordinate, private, regenerate, satiate; complete, concrete, replete; definite, erudite, exquisite, opposite, trite; absolute, destitute, minute. There are also assimilations, for the most part probably from nouns: affectionate, cristate, dentate, labiate, passionate, with second forms 'labiated, dentated, &c.'; favourite; cornute (cp. horn*ed*), hirsute, nasute, &c. (Compare Latin barbatus, cinctutus, cornutus, nasutus, &c., and the alleged adjectives from nouns by 'ed'—p. 246.)

The nouns are also numerous. Concept, conflict, credit, edict, exhibit, insect, joint, manuscript, merit, percept, point, precept; advocate, duplicate, mandate, reprobate; exquisite; attribute, statute, tribute.

From these are to be distinguished the few words that we have received from the fourth Latin declension. The most important of these are names of dignity, office, jurisdiction, province. Appetite, circuit, fruit, state; cardinalate, consulate (cp. consul*ship*), electorate (collective), magistrate (but magistra*cy*), potentate (originally abstract), protectorate.

Tude is added to adjectives to form abstract nouns. Attitude (cp. fitness, position, posture), beatitude (cp. happiness, blessing), fortitude (cp. bravery, endurance), gratitude (cp. gratefulness), latitude (cp. breadth), longitude (cp. length), magnitude (cp. greatness), rectitude (cp. uprightness), solicitude (cp. anxiety), turpitude (cp. baseness, disgrace). From these comparisons, we may see that this suffix is unnecessary. And many formations have not taken root: celsitude, pulchritude, &c. (in Chaucer); so that we need not regret that 'tude' is allowed to die out. 'Mul-

titude' is now only collective. 'Custom' might have been expected to appear as 'consuetude' (Latin consuetudinem).

Ty, (French té, Latin tạt-em), serves to form abstract nouns chiefly from adjectives. There is usually a connecting vowel, 'i' or (not so frequently) 'e'. Antiquity, certainty, dignity, liberality, liberty, malignity, piety and pity, plenty, poverty, property and propriety, prosperity, satiety, severity, variety. The concretes are often collective: city, gratuity, laity, university.

Ule, b(u)le, cule, cle, are mainly diminutive: animalcule, capsule, corpuscle, cuticle, globule, particle, pilule, pinnacle, pustule, tabernacle, uncle, versicle, vesicle. Sometimes the subject or the object of the root action is denoted, whence the transition to place or instrument is easy: fable, miracle, obstacle, oracle, receptacle, spectacle, stable.

Ure, (sure, ture), uniting with the supine, formed verbal abstract nouns. It is now used frequently to convert verbs into nouns expressing the verb action. Capture, censure, culture, gesture, imposture, rapture; departure, exposure, failure, nurture, pressure. Abstracts often become class nouns: adventure, aperture, caricature, creature, feature, picture, venture. Furniture, garniture, vesture, are collective.

Some take origin in roots that are not verbs: moisture, ordure, verdure, are from adjectives. In a few other cases, the ending is assimilated: leisure (O. E. leiser, O. Fr. loisir, leisir), pleasure (O. Fr. plaisir, pleisir), treasure (O. E. tresoure, O. Fr. trésor). 'Armour' (Lat. armatura) might have been expected to take this ending.

Several cases of **y** have been anticipated under—ary, cy (sy), nt, ory, (e)ry, &c. Setting aside these, 'y' is representative of various classical endings, which have been more or less modified in passing through French.

Especially in abstract, and sometimes in collective, nouns, derived mostly from adjectives and nouns, 'y' stands for the classical 'ia', 'condition, state'; or it forms words on the same model: nalogy, apostasy, colony, company, courtesy, geometry, family, harmony, jealousy, melancholy,

navy, perfidy, tragedy. Also in names of places: barony, buttery, (cp. 'ry', 'ery', 'ory'); Germany, Italy, Normandy, Thessaly. In names of countries, however, the 'ia' termination is very often adopted: Abyssinia, Arabia (poetic Araby), Arcadia, Assyria, Australia, California, &c.

Some originally abstract nouns take 'y' in place of 'ium': augury, larceny, obloquy, obsequy (Milton), remedy, study, subsidy,

From Latin participle (-at-): ally, attorney, deputy; chiefly abstracts and collectives—army, country, destiny, embassy, entry, jury, pansy. Compare 'ate' (p. 269), and 'ee', (p. 261).

'Atus' of the fourth declension gives a few in 'y': 'clergy, county, duchy, treaty. Compare 'ate', (p. 269), and 'cy (sy)', (p. 260).

Not least important is the verbal abstract formation in 'y': delivery (cp. deliverance), discovery, expiry, flattery, inquiry, recovery.

Summary of the Derivation of the Parts of Speech.

This is given with tolerable fulness in the grammar. The following are a few additional instances.

The Prefixes have been grouped and exemplified in detail, so that we shall have little occasion to refer to them. The Suffixes will claim the chief part of our attention.

In the derivation of Nouns by means of suffixes, the purposes to be served are mainly these:—

First, to obtain Abstract Nouns. The primitive nouns of the language are either class nouns or nouns of material: we resort to composition for our Abstract Nouns. In most cases we start from adjectives or from verbs: in a few instances abstract nouns are formed other nouns.

The main process for obtaining adjective abstract nouns is by our native suffix **ness**: there being a few old forms in **t, th**—height, truth. The classical abstract nouns (adjective) appear chiefly with the terminating **nce, ncy** (French)—abun-

dance, elegance, constancy, decency; ism (Greek)—rationalism; tude—plenitude; ty (Latin and French)—cruelty, equity; or y—philosophy. The verb abstracts are derived from verbs. The native termination is ing—being; the classical are—first of all, ion, next, age, al, ment, th, ure, y.

Second. Another class of verbal nouns that play a great part in grammar is the class expressing the agent; formed by the suffix er, ar, or: maker, speaker, liar, inspector, visitor.

The use of this noun is one of the equivalents of the verb: for 'he proposed terms' we may say 'he was the *proposer* of terms'. A transitive verb with an object is thus transformed into a noun followed by a phrase, which phrase is the object preceded by 'of'. A new shade of meaning is usually attached to this transformation of the verb, namely, habitual action. These nouns are found the convenient names for trades, avocations, and professions; the work itself being first stated as a verb. Hence to say 'he was the proposer of terms of peace', means that he was selected and entrusted with a special office or function, being his occupation for the time. 'Jupiter thunders' means one act; 'Jupiter was the thunderer' is a permanent characteristic. So 'he dissembled' (on some one occasion), 'he was a dissembler' (habitual).

The old endings, man, ster, ess, have a similar use. They denote characters, avocations, trades.

In 'claimant' we have another derivative expressing the agent. 'Claimer' is not so easy to pronounce as 'claimant', which follows the analogy of 'agent', 'client', 'tenant', 'vagrant', obtained from the present participle of the verbs.

Third. Nouns for the products or results of Action are not a very large class; they are mostly a secondary usage of the verb abstract. The greatest number end in ment: appointment, commandment, fragment, ornament. A few old forms end in m: bloom, gleam. Some in y: delivery, discovery. Some in t, and th: gift, flight, birth, death. Also: breakage, fissure, union, imposition, &c.

The ending al is used with some verbs to give verbal nouns, analogous to the Saxon 'ing': arrival, betrothal, burial, carousal, denial, dismissal, recital, renewal, reprisal, requital, revisal, revival. A compound of this class has recently come into prominence in connexion with the early history of mankind—'survival', something that survives.

A new form of verbal noun has lately come in: 'percept' for the thing perceived, the object of the verb made general; so 'concept' for the thing conceived in the act of conceiving. Our great Exhibitions of late years have introduced the term 'exhibit', as a noun for the things exhibited. In Chemistry a similar operation is performed in the verb 'distil', which yields 'distillate'; so—conglomerate, precipitate.

Fourth. Diminutives are a curious and interesting class. Their history is illustrative of feelings and manners; but their grammatical handling needs little commentary.

Fifth. Collective Nouns are usually compounds. They are often secondary usages of abstract nouns, or of class nouns (especially of such as denote place).

The suffixes are: y—aviary, infirmary, library, purgatory, reformatory, treasury; age—assemblage, foliage; hood—brotherhood, priesthood; (e)ry—finery, grapery, pleasantry; ism—positivism.

In compounding Adjectives, the leading purposes are these:—

First. Negation; for which we have the Saxon ending less (loose from): causeless, careless, cheerless, faithless, godless, needless, penniless, pithless, prayerless, purposeless, thankless, treeless, witless.

This does not give negation in the scientific or logical sense, but negation growing out of the marked absence of a certain thing, or quality ('careless', the absence of care), with an insinuation of the presence of some opposite or contrary quality. Many of them are intensified expressions of the logical negatives made up by the prefix un: unfaithful, faithless; unmerciful, merciless; unthankful, thankless; un-

wise, witless. So: innocent, guiltless; impenetrable (forests), cp. pathless: unimpassioned, dispassionate, passionless.

Second. In order to express, in an Adjective form, the prominent quality of a noun, there is a strong array of endings—Saxon and classical. Of the first, we have **ed**—spirited; **ful**—deceitful; **ish**—boyish; **like** or **ly**—business-like, homely; **some**—burdensome.

This process is attended with considerable vagueness. In the first place, there is not a well-sustained distinction among the different endings. In some words, 'ish' is diminutive and slighting, as 'boyish', 'Romish'. But, in the main, sound determines the selection: 'beautiful' sounds well, and so does 'lovely'; but the reversed endings would be hard to pronounce.

The ending **y** is kept very closely to nouns of material: less frequently it joins with abstract nouns, and sometimes with class nouns.

The ending **ed** is the perfect participle of the new or modern verbs; but, in a few instances, it is applied to nouns.

The syllable **en** (Anglo-Saxon genitive) was in use to form a class of adjectives from nouns of material, to express 'being made of', 'like': flaxen, golden, wooden.

Classical endings:—**al**—celestial, ceremonial, constructional, postal, substantial; **ar**—globular, regular, vulgar; **arian**—latitudinarian; **ary, ory**—pecuniary, sanitary, traditionary, statutory; **ate** (rare)—affectionate, passionate; **esque**—grotesque, picturesque; **ian**—antediluvian, Baconian; **ic**—gigantic, monarchic, nitric; **ist-ic**—altruistic, Calvinistic, characteristic, materialistic, ritualistic; **ose, ous**—jocose, igneous, joyous, porous.

Of **al** I had occasion to remark in discussing the Adjective. It has really no meaning, unless what may grow up in connection with particular words. It gives the form of an Adjective to the reality of a noun. 'Postal communication' gives only the meaning that could be got from 'Post communication'; 'ceremonial law' does not throw any new light upon what is divined from 'ceremony law'; 'personal application' is 'application in person'.

The addition of 'al' is often melodious; and the compound may at last be differentiated so as to give a meaning different from the mere noun in position. The 'patriarchal state' is more agreeable to the ear than the 'patriarch state': and it has taken on a particular meaning, which would not be suggested by the nouns—the state of society where the rulers are the chiefs of families.

A similar remark applies to **an, rian**, which are variations regulated mainly by sound. They mean nothing that could not be inferred by taking the two nouns together. 'A unitarian hypothesis or scheme' is more simply a 'unity scheme'; we may make of it what we can.

The foreign ending **ous** is of wide-spread occurrence; and its compounds have generally a distinctive meaning, which they have inherited from their Latin usage.

The Adjectives compounded from other Adjectives are mostly formed by prefixes. Of these, the most notable are the ones for negation—**un, dis, non, in (im)**.

A slightly diminutive effect is given by the suffix **ish**—reddish, sweetish, ticklish. The addition of **ly** to an existing adjective leads to new shades of meaning: 'good' and 'goodly' are somewhat different. The ending **ary** gives such words as—secondary, solitary, &c.

The derivation of Adjectives from Verbs is next to be noted. Foremost are the two participles, which pass into Adjectives by an easy step; 'a *living* poet', 'a *celebrated* general'. The shortening of qualifying clauses leads to this usage; and there comes a stage when we must parse such words as adjectives solely; that is, when, without reference to the original verb form, they have been habitually coupled with nouns, and still more, if, in being so coupled, they have taken on new shades of meaning.

The termination **ble** gives origin to a very characteristic meaning, which ought to be maintained consistently. The irregularity of using 'sensible' (man) as (a man) 'of sense' is pointed out in the grammar. Another questionable compound is 'pleasurable', which cannot be rendered according to the regular meaning of 'ble'; we might have 'pleasable'

for one 'that can be pleased' (like 'placable'). Equally uncouth is 'seasonable', which might be used for a soup that did not refuse to take on seasoning. In both these instances the meaningless 'al' would have been more in keeping. With the forms 'pleasing' and 'pleasant', it is difficult to discover the need of 'pleasurable'. (For 'ble', see p. 259.)*

This is one of the most valuable endings in our language. The situation of possibility or potentiality is of constant occurrence; and one of the merits of Aristotle was to have been the first to given it expression. Moreover, it is a soft and pleasing termination, and a relief in sound from our heavy verbal ending ed, which is unavoidably frequent. The old potential mood, made up by may and can, is intended for the same purpose; and gives also the distinction, sometimes useful, between permission and physical ability. The passive gerund sometimes gives the meaning of possibility: 'that is *not to be thought of*'.

The classical ending ive is of value in stating the active meaning of the verb, in much the same way as the imperfect participle: repressive (repressing), imaginative (imagining).

As usual, when there are two forms for the same thing, there is a tendency to assume a various shade of meaning; so that the compound in 'ive' does not always signify the same as the participle. 'Active', 'passive', 'sensitive', and 'conservative', are words of great consequence, with no precise equivalents.

The termination should not be used passively, as is sometimes done: 'collective strength' ought to be 'collected'; 'derivative' sometimes means 'what is derived', a 'derivate'.

* In Latin, the termination was used actively as well as passively. In late Latin, and in French, the active use seems to have been fully maintained. The addition of 'ble' to *nouns*—reasonable (Latin 'rationabilis', French 'raisonnable'), peacable (paisible), profitable—has been frequently made in English, with not very satisfactory results. As examples, we have 'statutable' (which might have followed the general law), and 'conscionable' (apparently imitating the French).

The active compounds in 'ble', as 'forcible', 'durable', would be more properly 'forcive', 'durative'.

'The *elective* house of Parliament' is a singular departure from the use of 'ive'. Strictly interpreted, it is the house that elects, or has the power to elect; instead of which, it is not even the house that may be elected, the electable house, but the house that *is* elected, now and at all times.

The present participle of the Latin verb gives us the ending **nt**: clamant, pleasant, prevalent, redolent. This is very nearly the same as our active participle—pleasing, prevailing, &c. A few of the examples have no English participle: elegant, valiant, indolent, potent.

Another Latin ending is **ory**: consolatory, hortatory, obligatory, perfunctory, promissory, satisfactory, valedictory. These forms are mainly of use in high-sounding diction, or in varying the phraseology to the sated ear. The less frequent cases, **ful, less, some, y**, have been exemplified under these heads: forgetful, relentless, meddlesome, wieldy.

On the Derivation of VERBS, there is nothing to add, by way of summary, to what is given in the Grammar.

To show the use to be made of Derivation, let us select some compounds that have obtained currency, but still divide opinion as to their propriety. The word 'talented' has come recently into circulation, although under energetic protests. John Sterling calls it 'a mere newspaper and hustings word', invented, he believed, by O'Connell. As a compound, there is something about it that offends us; and we ask—Does it come under any of the regular classes of Adjectives in 'ed'? Now we have already reviewed these compounds (p. 246), and the conclusion is that they have a participial meaning, and are most regular when the root is a verb—learned, rooted, beloved. When the root is a noun that cannot be turned into a verb, we feel a certain repugnance to the compound, until custom has blunted our sensibility. It is obvious, therefore, that such exceptionable compounds should not be multiplied unnecessarily.

Another doubtful compound is the adjective 'lengthy', which has gained footing in the sense of 'rather long', 'long to tediousness'. When we survey the adjectives in 'y', from nouns, we find that they are almost all nouns of material: airy, balmy, cloudy, dungy, foggy, grassy, groggy, inky, lawny, lofty (the lift or sky), milky, murky, oily, rocky, seedy, silvery, skyey, watery. A few represent qualities of the mind: greedy, lucky, needy, sleepy, speedy, sulky, tricky. Some are from class names: flowery, boggy, hilly, leafy, quaggy, starry, thorny, toothy, whinny. The nearest approach to 'lengthy' is seen in 'mighty', from the abstract noun 'might'; but this is a verbal abstract, and does not proceed, as 'length' does, from a prior adjective (long). There is no such sequence as—'long, length, lengthy'.* When we want the adjective we may go back to the primary 'long', instead of coining a new adjective from the abstract noun. Moreover, we have already a variation in the participle 'lengthened', used for what is unduly protracted. What is insinuated by 'lengthy', if not implied in 'long', might be given by 'tedious', 'tiresome', and the like.

We may judge of this instance by supposing farther applications. How should we like 'depthy', 'truthy'?

EXAMPLES OF DERIVATION.

Among the inaccuracies that may be regarded as grammatical errors, we include misused prefixes or suffixes.

'Nature is a term of too vague *significance* to be used in close reasoning'. The correct term is the verbal abstract 'signification', equal to 'what the word signifies'. 'Significance' is the abstract of the adjective 'significant', and follows the meaning of that adjective: 'the significance of

* If 'health' be from 'whole', then we have a similar sequence: 'whole, health, healthy'. But in this case the difference of meaning is more of a justification than in the other.

So, if 'wealth' be from 'welig (weli)', 'rich' (from 'wel', 'well'), then there is another sequence of the same kind: 'welig (well), wealth, wealthy'.

the act was very great' is the same as 'the act was very significant':

'For my own part, I doubt the *application* of the Danish rule to the English' (Latham, quoted by Breen, p. 99). Say 'applicability'. The meaning is 'I do not think it possible to apply the rule'. 'Application' is the same as 'applying', which scarcely makes sense with 'I doubt'. We might say 'I do not approve of *the application*, or the applying of the rule'.

Shakespeare uses '*sightless* substances' (literally, 'substances *unable to see*') for '*invisible* substances'.

In the following lines there are several inaccuracies:—

'But *signs* of *nobleness*, like stars, shall shine
On all *deservers* !'

The participle 'deserving' would be more suitable than 'deservers'; the desert arose from one notable action, and not from a permanent habit or quality. 'Nobleness' is the abstract noun confined to the virtue of being noble; for rank, we use the classical abstract, 'nobility'. 'Signs' should be 'marks', 'tokens', or 'decorations'.

Pope says of Homer's invention that it makes his speeches more affecting and *transported*, for 'transporting'.

Milton's '*native* to famous wits' is a misuse of the word; the meaning to be conveyed is 'giving birth to'; 'native' is 'what is born'. By a figurative abbreviation 'native *place*' means 'birth-place'; we could say '*native place of* famous wit'. There is a certain departure from the meaning of 'ive' in the passive siginfication of 'native': but this is because the verb is itself passive, and has no active.

Cowley speaks of 'the *inexperienced* rashness of a beardless boy', which construed strictly would mean that the boy's rashness had not been experienced by any one. He means 'rashness growing out of inexperience'; 'rash inexperience' would be more appropriate.

Dean Alford remarks on the anomalous use of 'enclosure' for the documents wrapped up in a letter or written communication. An enclosure is an enclosed space, a space closed in by a fence. What we mean in the other case is

more correctly given by 'enclosed', 'contained', 'contents'.

A '*paralytic* limb' should be a '*paralyzed* limb'.

As Exercises in Derivation, we may compare and contrast the several derivatives of the same root.

Thus, 'imagination, imaginative, imaginable, imaginary', have different meanings, according to the suffixes. 'Imagination' is the verbal abstract noun; the others are adjectives: 'imaginative' has the active meaning, 'able to imagine'; 'imaginable', 'able to be imagined'; 'imaginary' is made up of one of the vague suffixes, which in this instance serves to contrast imagination with reality.

So: deception, deceptive, deceiving, deceiver, deceivable, deceived, deceit.

Skill, skilled, skilful, unskilful, unskilfulness.

Value, valued, valuable, invaluable, valueless.

Provident, providence, providential, unprovidential, improvident, improvidence, unprovided. Cp. prudent, &c.

Nature, natural, naturalness, unnatural, preternatural, supernatural.

Commit, committed, committal, commission, commitment, uncommitted.

Induce, induced, inducement, induction.

Prepare, preparation, preparedness, unprepared, ill-prepared.

Dr. Chalmers, speaking of his success in dealing with pauperism in Glasgow, declared that what he had done was not an 'experi*ment*' but an 'experi*ence*'.

Compare 'exceptiona*l*' with 'exceptio*nable*', which are apt to be confounded.

'Our short and *troublesome* sleep'. We usually attach to 'troublesome' the active idea of 'giving, causing trouble'. Here we should perhaps expect 'troubled'.

Compare—unable and disabled; simulate, dissimulate; retrospective, introspective, introspection; character, characterless, characteristic; falsehood, falsity; unending, endless; sensation, sensitive; infringement, infraction; gratefulness, gratitude; progress, regress; beautify, modernize;

transmontane, ultramontane; approve, approbation, reprobation.

Take to pieces—unselfishness, unrighteousness, unprofessional, irreparable, unconvinced, rehabilitate, reconciliation, maladministration, foretaste, incommunicable.

SYNTAX.

CONCORD.

THE process named Concord enters very largely into the classical languages, and very little into ours. It is not a necessity of language, while in the degree that it prevails in Latin and in Greek, it is a serious incumbrance.

When by inflecting a noun for the plural, we intend to speak of more than one thing—book, books—there is not any call to operate also upon the verb, so as to state the same fact twice over: '*a* book *is*', 'book*s are*'. The hearer should be content with one clear indication of plurality. Still less is it necessary, as is done in Latin, to give every adjective one form for a singular noun and another form for a plural noun.

Although, as a general rule, these duplicate inflections are superfluous, there may arise occasions when they prevent ambiguity. If a verb is so placed that it may refer to either of two subjects, and if one is singular, and the other plural, the inflection decides between them. Examples will occur under ORDER OF WORDS.

It is proposed here to exemplify the doubtful and difficult cases of Concord, and farther to show how our concords may be turned to account in making composition more perspicuous and more forcible.

CONCORD OF NUMBER.

The Concord of NUMBER includes three cases—Noun and Verb, Noun and Pronoun, and Noun and Adjective. The same remarks apply to all.

The first point to be illustrated relates to plural nouns in singular form, the so-called Nouns of Multitude. In deciding whether a verb or a pronoun adjective is to be in the plural, we must look to the *meaning* of the noun, and not simply to the form. We may have a singular meaning in a plural form, and a plural meaning in a singular form.

It is to be regarded as a principle of concord that the plural verb and the plural pronoun adjective should be brought into play for *real plurality* of the subject. The true idea of the Plural Verb is a condensation of singular assertions. For—'John *is* here, Peter *is* here, Mary *is* here', we say, more shortly, 'John, Peter, and Mary *are* here'. A number of propositions are expressed together, but are still to be understood separately and severally. Unless we can resolve a plural construction into a number of distinct singular affirmations, the employment of the plural is not justified.

We shall now furnish additional examples of the delicacies of plural concord.

'*Nine-tenths* of every man's happiness *depends* upon his reception among his fellows in society'. There is here the appearance, but not the reality, of a plural subject; 'nine-tenths' is merely a figure for a large amount, nearly the whole, of a man's happiness. We could not resolve the statement thus—one-tenth depends, and another tenth depends, and so on. If a property were divided into shares or portions, and one share allocated to one person, and three shares to another, the verb in concord with the three shares would be plural; there would be a real division of parts, and a distinct application of each separate part.

The collectives—a majority, a minority—have a singular verb for collective action: 'the majority *is* resolved'; but a plural verb for individual action: 'the majority *are* on their way home'.

'The *multitude* wondered, when *they* saw the dumb to speak, . . .; and *they* glorified the God of Israel. Then Jesus called His disciples unto Him, and said, I have com-

passion on the *multitude*, because *they continue* with me now three days, and *have* nothing to eat: and I will not send *them* away fasting, lest *they* faint in the way'. In all these instances there is sufficient individuality of action to justify plural concords.

'This *people draweth* (draw) nigh unto me with *their* mouth, and *honoureth* me with *their* lips; but *their* heart is far from me'.

Collectiveness preponderates in the following: 'An evil and adulterous *generation seeketh* after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to *it* but the sign of the prophet Jonas. . . . The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn *it*'.

All intimations to people generally when addressed as *the public*, must be plural: 'the public *are* requested to enter *their* names in the book'.

'A *group* of fine young children were growing up about him'.

'The Jewish *people were* all free'; the same as 'The Jews'.

'The *cattle* on a thousand hills *are* his'.

'The lowing *herd wind* slowly o'er the lea'.

'All the pigeon *tribe* generally *produce* two eggs'.

'The oviparous *fish* have a divided uterus'.

The following, though not a concord of noun and verb, but one of pronoun and antecedent, exemplifies the principle: 'He would not suffer his people to forget, he would not suffer *them* to hope'. 'Hoping' is an act that applies to individuals: 'people' is the same as 'subjects', and a real plural.

Still more numerous are plural forms with strictly singular meanings.

Portions of time, although taken collectively, are often expressed with the plural noun, but a plural verb is not to be used: 'With Thee, a thousand *years is* as one day'. (Compare with this—'Ten thousand *swords leap* from their scabbards'.) 'The first *thirty years* of this century (not *were*, but) *was* a dreary time for a liberal clergyman'.

It is the same with sums of money: 'two *shillings is* the

fare'. The principle applies also to the following: 'Two dead languages *is* too much to impose upon the generality of students'. The meaning is not—one dead language is too much, and a second is too much,—but that the sum of the two is too much.

Take now some examples of the concord of singular nouns and pronouns coupled with 'and' and 'or'.

When 'and' couples two synonyms, or two words used for one meaning, the idea is singular, and so should be the verb: 'a *hue* and *cry was* raised'. 'The *sand* and *mud*, produced by wearing down the land, gradually *raises* the sea bottom': 'sand' and 'mud' are not two distinct materials, but two separate names used to give complete expression to the material that fills up the sea depths.

'*The long* and *the short* of the matter *is* —'.

'The *power* and *value* of English literature *was* thereby impaired'. (M. Arnold.)

'*One king, one law, one faith was* still the maxim universally accepted'. The singular verb is justified by supposing a collectiveness in the subject.

'All *the furniture, the stock of shops, the machinery which could be found in the realm, was* of less value than the property which some single parishes now contain'. (Macaulay.)

'The *sound*, the *rhythm*, the *modulation*, the *music*, of the language *was one* entirely new'. This is taking the utmost possible liberty with the singular concord. The plea must be that the four terms are synonyms.

When the two names express distinct ideas, the general rule is rigid: 'The *continuation* and the *revival afford*—'.

'In this *lies* both *its merit* and *its defect*'—is bad grammar.

Another exceptional case is furnished by combined couples: '*Trial and error is* the source of our knowledge'; 'the *composition and resolution* of forces *was* largely applied by Newton'; 'the *ebb and flow* of (the) tides *is* now understood'; '*cause and effect has* been called an intuitive conception'.

Disjunctives with 'or', according to the general rule, have a singular verb: but the disjunction is not always real.

'Either John or James *is* mistaken', is a case of strict singularity, there being only one subject in operation: we must choose between John and James, we cannot have both together. But 'or' is a word often very loosely applied; in many instances, 'and' would be more suitable to the meaning. 'The Army *or* the Navy *answer* to that description': there is no real disjunction in such a case; the Army does not exclude the Navy, the predicate applies to each and to both. If, therefore, we choose to retain 'or', we must yet make the verb plural. But this construction is not to be encouraged.

De Quincey says 'Neither Coleridge nor Southey *is* a good reader of verse'. There would be an awkwardness in saying 'are', but the meaning is plural: 'Both Coleridge and Southey *are* bad readers of verse'.

'More known, *or* less known, *have* two distinct meanings'. The disjunction here is formal and not real; it amounts only to this, that we should consider, in separate acts of study, or one at a time, 'more known' and 'less known'; but the predicate applies equally to both, and neither excludes the other. It is an abuse of 'or'.

I now submit, for consideration, the following suggestions as to the best mode of turning to account the Plural Concord. Generally speaking, we have to pronounce it an otiose and superfluous formality; in particular instances it may lend force to the expression. Let us, therefore, in the employment of the concord, be guided by the circumstances.

It is not meant that we are to make good or bad grammar at pleasure. What I have in view is this. Our language affords us opportunities of evading the concord of subject and verb; we have not only singular forms, and plural forms, but also neuter forms. The neuter forms are the past tense, and the auxiliaries—shall, will, may, can, must; moreover, there is no concord when the noun is the object, and we can often throw a subject into an object position without changing the meaning.

Our policy, then, would be to use the singular form when singularity or individuality is marked and pronounced; to

use the plural form when plurality in the subject is of importance; and to make choice of a neuter form when it is better not to call attention to the number of the subject.

As regards emphatic singulars, we have not in the language any stronger words, nor any more effective aids, to impress the individuality of the subject, than the third person singular, present and past, of 'be'. 'God *is*', 'There *is* a God', give an intense expression of the unity of God, as taught in monotheistic religions. Next to 'is', we may place the singular pronouns and demonstratives, which still farther contribute to the emphasis of individuality: I, thou, he, she, it, this, that, my, thy, his, her. Consider how strongly the attention is fixed upon the singleness of the individual in the following verse: 'Who *is this* that *cometh* from Edom? *this* that *is* glorious in *his* apparel, travelling in the greatness of *his* strength'.

The occasions are frequent when plurality is an important and leading circumstance; and when the help of concord is not to be thrown away. 'The *gates are* closed' is a significant and serviceable concord, to signify that the approaches, one and all, are now shut; but if, as sometimes happens, the plural 'gates' means only the two halves of one gate, the plural verb is wasted on an idle concord.

There is a striking and appropriate emphasis of plurality in the following, from Macaulay: 'The principal strongholds of the Englishry during this evil time *were* Enniskillen and Londonderry'; a model sentence in every way.

'Socrates *does* not believe in the gods that the Athenians *believe* in'. Here the concord of the verb suits the emphasis of the occasion: Socrates stands alone in his views; the Athenians agree in theirs; it is one man against the multitude.

More numerous still are the cases where plurality, although unavoidably stated by the noun, is wholly unimportant, and where one feels relief in not having the attention called to it by a plural verb. For such cases, our neutral forms are a convenience; and there may be occasions when it is worth the trouble to select them.

First of all, in false plurals, or plural nouns with singular meaning, we may not always be at liberty to use the singular construction. If I say 'His nerves *is* exhausted', I seem guilty of bad grammar; 'nerves' being accounted a real plural, as it really is in the regular use of the word—'the spinal nerves', 'the nerves of the face'. But in the phrase quoted, the word is figurative for the nervous system collectively; and it is a pity to drag the concord of the verb into the service of a figure of speech. Let us therefore say, in some evasive form: 'his nerves may be exhausted', 'he has exhausted his nerves', and so on.

'The accounts *are* unfavourable' often means some single communication, although the noun is plural: 'we hear unfavourable accounts'.

'Cards *were* invented to amuse an insane king'. This is wholly improper, and yet it would shock our ears to say—'cards *was* invented'. We should either put it—'The game of cards', or change the form—'Some one invented cards', &c.

'His remains *were* buried' is awkward; 'remains' is a false plural: 'they buried his remains', 'he was interred'.

'Languages *are* too much regarded as an end'. The meaning here is collective, yet we could not say 'is'. Change the construction: 'Language is too much regarded', 'people are apt to regard languages as an end'.

'The expenses *are* considerable'. This plural often signifies one particular outlay; and to add the plural verb (especially the marked plurals of the verb 'be') is to go beyond the necessities of the case. Either say the 'expense', or use a neutral construction: 'the expenses would, might, must be ——'.

'Damages *were* awarded'; 'the jury awarded damages'.

'The three angles of a triangle *are* together equal to two right angles'. This is certainly wrong, but the remedy does not consist in making the verb singular: 'The *sum* of the three angles—*is*'; or 'The three angles *may be* shown to be ——'.

'The well-known *verses* of Moschus on the perpetual re-

nascence of vegetables *are* founded on a false antithesis'. It cannot be the case that these verses are individually and separately founded, it is that the entire collection, or the poem, is founded. This is a case for evading the concord.

'At thy right hand *are* pleasures for evermore'. The plural noun here means, not so much variety, or plurality, as intensity or amount.

'The cock's shrill clarion *or* the echoing horn
No more *shall* rouse them'.

If we were to change 'or' into 'and', the 'shall' would be a convenient evasion of the plural, there being no occasion to trouble the reader with the separate action of the two rousing influences.

'Truths that wake
To perish never;
Which neither listlessness, nor mad endeavour,
Nor man, nor boy,
Nor all that is at enmity with joy,
Can utterly abolish or destroy!'

Here though the verb should formally be singular, still the number of alternated subjects is strongly suggestive of plurality; and 'can' is fortunately neutral.

It is an aggravation of the unnecessary plurals of nouns of material—bricks, coals, apples, potatoes, peas, eggs, rags—to construe them with the plural verb: 'Eggs *are* a shilling a dozen'; 'bricks *are* scarce'.

So with the poetic metaphors—the shadows of the night, the tremblings of the dawn, the freshened fields, the waters of the Jordan; we should, if possible, avoid the too literal effect of a plural concord.

Let us try the working of these considerations in ordinary composition.

'But an *aggregate* [collective noun] of contemporary individuals of the same species *cannot* [good evasion of number] be properly said to form a generation, except by assuming that *they*, and also *their children*, *are* all born respectively at the same time [the plural 'are' is especially wanted; there is an emphasis put upon the separateness of the individuals].'

'One generation of men *does* not go off the stage at once, and another *succeed*'. The singular 'does' is too individual for the occasion, while the plural form is not allowed; there is a convenient neutrality in the ellipsis 'another succeed'.

Take a few sentences from one of Macaulay's highly-wrought passages, where he omitted no device that he thought suitable for emphasis.

'It *is* the nature of man to overrate present evil, and to underrate present good; to long for what he *has* not, and to be dissatisfied with what he *has*'. The singulars here are very emphatic, and strictly grammatical. There are four subjects to 'is'—a synonymous pair of obverse couples; the singular is admissible, and preferable. For 'man' or 'mankind', the author boldly uses 'he', and gets the benefit of individual action, which is always more impressive than a diluted plurality where the separate action is not manifest and imposing.

'*This* propensity, as *it appears* in individuals, *has* often been noticed both by laughing and by weeping philosophers'. It is good to individualize the propensity; and the duty is amply performed by four concords. The plurals 'individuals' and 'philosophers' are as well out of the way of the concords; it is not necessary to carry farther the emphasis of plurality.

'*It was a* favourite *theme* of Horace and of Pascal'. The singular emphasis is still farther sustained by the singular predicate, 'a theme': There is now quite enough of singularizing stress.

'To its influence on the fate of great *communities may be* [are to be] ascribed most of the *revolutions* and *counter-revolutions* recorded in history'. These plurals are important and significant enough to have the support of plural concords; it is not in *one* community, but in *many*, not *one* revolution, but a great number. We may, therefore, change the neutral 'may be' to the emphatic plural 'are to be'.

'A hundred generations *have* passed away since the first great national emancipation, of which an account *has* come down to us'. The 'have' is emphatically in concord with

the 'hundred', although it is usual to take time in the lump, even when expressed by number. The 'has' is a needless obtrusion of singularity. The sentence, on other grounds, is improvable: 'the first great national emancipation that has been recorded—on record'.

CONCORD OF GENDER.

The Concord of Gender does not call for much discussion. I shall be content with noticing the distinction between personality, whether masculine or feminine, and impersonality.

A personal subject has for concords the personal pronouns, and the adjectives formed from them—my, mine, his, her, &c. An impersonal subject is mainly supported by the pronoun 'it'. We have also a neuter relative 'which'.

Notwithstanding the very full discussion of 'it' under THE PRONOUN, a further remark may be made in the present connection. This pronoun, being so much used for trivial matters, and often for almost nothing at all, is rendered inadequate to express a vast subject with dignity. Every one must feel that for vast, powerful, imposing objects, there is a letting down when these have to be referred to by 'it'.

For example:—'With him, co-infinite with immensity, coeval with eternity, *the universe* is a span, *its* duration a moment.' Try and avoid the pronoun—'the universe in extent is a span, in duration a moment'.

> 'Thou glorious mirror, where *the Almighty's form*
> Glasses *itself* in tempests.' (Byron.)

Could be avoided by 'is glassed', or by 'the Almighty glasses *His* form'.

'Tis *Heaven itself* (Heaven's own self) that points out an Hereafter'. (Addison.)

> '*The great globe itself*,
> Yea, all which *it* inherit, shall dissolve'.

In the following, we might fancy an appropriateness in the all-work pronoun to help out the speaker's energetic contempt: 'This most excellent canopy, *the air*, look you,

this majestical roof fretted with golden fire, why, *it* appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours'.

'And he . . . showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, having the glory of God: and *her* light was like unto a stone most precious, ...' 'And he that talked with me had a golden reed to measure the city, and the gates *thereof*, and the walls *thereof*. . . . . The length and the breadth and the height of *it* are equal'. The subject, so gorgeously described, is not for some time reduced to 'it'; first there is a timely personification 'her', and next the adverbial substitute 'thereof'.

So, the fall of Babylon, 'that great city', is described without the use of 'it', through personification.

'I invoke the ministers of *Religion*, that they proclaim *its* denunciation of those crimes, and add *its* solemn sanctions to the authority of human laws'. (Daniel Webster.) Compare with this the following sentence of Robert Hall's: '*Religion* is too much interested in your success not to lend you *her* aid; *she* will shed over this enterprise *her* selectest influence'.

'And every *soul*, *it* passed me by,
Like the whiz of my cross-bow!' (Coleridge.)

'Let my *soul* live, and *it* shall praise thee'.

'The *spirit* shall return to Him
That gave *its* heavenly spark;
Yet, think not, Sun, *it* shall be dim
When thou thyself art dark!
No! *it* shall live again'. (Campbell.)

'It' is very appropriate for the intangibility of a *ghost*:

'*Hamlet.* Did you not speak to *it*?
Horatio. My lord, I did;
But answer made *it* none: yet once methought
It lifted up *its* head and did address
Itself to motion, like as *it* would speak'.
(*Hamlet*, I. 2.)

To come, however, to the proper Concord of Gender, a farther circumstance has to be noted. When human beings are expressed collectively, the nouns are neuter, and the pronouns that recall them must be neuter. Any one that has had to draw up resolutions for public bodies must have often felt uncomfortable at having to lower the collective body to 'it', while each individual would be 'he' or 'she'. Yet there is no alternative. Even so powerful an assembly as our House of Commons must be styled 'it', when in want of a pronoun. The only means of surmounting the indignity is to avoid using pronouns as far as possible; partly by repeating the original word, and partly by ingenuity of construction.

'Can *Parliament* be so dead to *its* dignity and duty, as to give *their* support to measures thus obtruded and forced upon *them?*' (Chatham.) The orator shrinks from the repetition of 'its', 'it', and violates concord by passing off to 'their' and 'them'.

'Sir, let *the House of Commons* be warned—let *it* warn *itself*—against all illusions'. (Gladstone.) The speaker being one of the house, could have said—'let *us* warn *ourselves* ——'.

'The desperate state of our *army* abroad is in part known. No man more highly esteems and honours the British *troops* than I do; I know *their* virtues and *their* valour; I know *they* can achieve anything but impossibilities'. (Chatham.) The formal plural 'troops' is a useful stepping-stone to the more dignified pronoun.

Although in wording resolutions, in the ordinary course of business, both houses of Parliament use the singular construction—the House resolves—yet in the conferences that take place when the Houses differ on the provisions of a Bill, each House styles itself by a plural—The Lords, The Commons. The reasons, on the part of the House of Commons, for disapproving of the alterations made by the Lords on a measure as sent up to them, are worded thus: 'The *Commons have* felt it their bounden duty to state the

foregoing reasons for *their* disagreement with certain of the amendments sent down by the Lords.

'Her Majesty's *Government hold* that it is *its* duty under these circumstances to do *its* best to maintain an attitude of strict neutrality, to act with the utmost impartiality towards all parties, believing that by so doing *they* would be in a better position, whenever a favourable opportunity should offer, to act with greater influence and utility'.

The writer begins and ends by regarding 'Government' as a plurality, though in the two intervening cases he wavers and goes over to the singular. This departure from the plural construction is here aggravated by the clash with the prospective reference of 'it'. To be consistent, we should have 'their' for 'its' in both cases. Or, keeping prominent the oneness and collective action of the Government, we may remodel thus: 'Her Majesty's Government *considers* it a duty under these circumstances to do the best (what may be done) to maintain——'; and for 'they', we may repeat the subject, which is important and somewhat distant for a mere pronoun reference: 'believing that by so doing *the Government* would be in a better position'.

'The French *Senate* under the First and Second Empire, though *its* members were appointed by the Chief of the State, *were* not unfairly selected from the same classes which Mr. Fawcett would place by their own right in the Upper House'.

The Senate, as a collective body of members, is necessarily represented by 'its'; yet the intervention of 'members', breaking up the body into the constituent individuals, almost precludes the use of a singular predicate. The unsatisfactory vacillation between singular and plural may be remedied. Either drop 'its'—'though *the* members were appointed'; or begin with plurality at once—'The *members* of the French Senate, though appointed by the Chief of the State, *were* not unfairly selected'.

The following is an unnecessary degradation of collective mankind by the use of 'it'; 'Though the apparent happiness of *mankind* (be) 'is' not always a true measure of *its*

real happiness, it is the best measure we have'. Say '*their* real happiness'.

ORDER OF WORDS.

This is a very large subject; its beginnings are in Grammar, and its full development is in Rhetoric.

One-half of the words of a language qualify the other half; and in English, position is almost the only thing that shows the incidence of qualifying adjuncts. The Adjectives and the Adverbs, with their equivalent phrases and clauses, are the qualifying parts of speech.

INVERSION OF SUBJECT AND VERB.

The Subject goes before the Verb. To begin with the verb is rare and difficult. The cases are stated in the grammar. Most important is the seventh exception to the regular arrangement—the attaining of Emphasis. This admits of being farther exemplified.

We can put the verb before its subject by commencing with an adverb. The commonest example is the case of 'There' with the verb 'be': 'there is, was, should be, a law'. Less frequently, 'there' is used with other verbs: there came, there appeared, there continued, there exists, there lived, there dwelt, there goes.

So with 'here'. 'Here is the scissors', 'here stand the attendants', 'here lies the road to Rome', 'here lies the point', 'here hung those lips that I have kissed I know not how oft'.

'Now' is another adverb used for inversions: 'For *now* began to unroll the most awful series of calamities that have ever visited the sons and daughters of men'.

So, instead of—'The great law which governs exchangeable value has *now* been stated and argued', we could say, with some advantage to the emphasis of the passage, '*Now* has been stated the great law that regulates exchangeable value'.

'*Now* fades the glimmering landscape on the sight'.

The following might be changed—

'*Now* the storm begins to lower'.

Say—

'*Now* begins the storm to lower'.

'*Now* on the Ochils gleams the sun'.

Other Adverbs:—

'*Oft* did the harvest to their sickle yield'.

'*Soon after* began the busy and important part of Swift's life'.

'*Herein* is love'.

'*So* work the honey bees'.

'*Scarcely* had—— &c.'

'*No sooner* had—— &c.'

'*Never, not* even under the tyranny of Laud, *had the condition* of the Puritans been so deplorable as at this time. *Never had spies* been so actively employed in detecting congregations. *Never had* magistrates, grand jurors, rectors, and churchwardens been so much on the alert'. (Macaulay.)

'*Thus* died Noah: according to all that God commanded him, *so* did he'.

'And *thus* spake on that ancient man'.

'*Then* shook the hills, with thunder riven,
Then rushed the steed to battle driven,
And louder than the bolts of heaven,
Far flashed the red artillery'.

'*Then* shrieked the timid, and stood still the brave'.

'*Then* ensued a scene of woe'.

'*How* vain the ardour of the crowd,
How low, *how* little, are the crowd,
How indigent the great!'

The inversion is here influenced by the figure of exclamation.

Also with 'such': '*Such* is the aspect of this shore'; '*such* was his fate'.

To the same effect are employed Adverbial phrases: '*In my father's house* are many mansions'; '*Amidst the thickest carnage* blazed the helmet of Navarre'; '*between them* lay,

during a considerable time, a middle party'; '*at the same time* came the disciples unto Jesus'; '*the same day* went Jesus out of the house'; '*at length* did cross an albatross'; '*into the valley of death* rode the Six Hundred'.

'*Within a window'd niche of that high hall*
Sate Brunswick's fated chieftain'.

Darwin, speaking of the two highest forms of the anthropoid apes, says: 'and from the latter, at a remote period, Man, the wonder and the glory of the Universe, proceeded'. He could have said—'from the latter, at a remote period, *proceeded Man*, the wonder and the glory of the Universe'.

Mätzner quotes examples showing an adverbial clause in the foreground.

'Wherever flagged his own, or *failed* the opposing *force*, *glittered* his white *robe*, and *rose* his bloody *battle-axe*'. (Lytton.)

'While the government of the Tudors was in its highest vigour *took* place an *event* which &c'. (Macaulay.)

'Not as the world giveth *give I* unto you'.

'But when the day-blush bursts from high,
Expires that magic *melody*'. (Byron.)

The complement sometimes has an adverbial force:

'*Fair laughs* the morn'.
'Full knee-deep *lies* the winter *snow*'.
'High *rode* in cloudless blue the *moon*'.
'Open *fly* th' infernal *doors*'.
'All *bloodless* lay th' untrodden snow'.
'*Still* stood the Bruce'.
'Nor *second* he, that rode sublime'.

'If love can sigh
For one alone,
Well-pleased am I
To be that one'. (Moore.)

This inversion is used to reserve the statement of the subject to the end; an effect sometimes sought in prose, but far oftener in poetry. The following are examples from Gray, who used it very largely:—

'Far from the sun and summer-gale,
In thy green lap *was* Nature's darling laid'.

But for the rhyme, it could have been '*was laid* Nature's darling'.

'From yonder realms of empyrean day
Burst's on my ear th' indignant *lay:*
There *sit* the sainted sage, the *bard* divine, &c.

'Uprose the King of Men with speed'.

Otherwise,

'Uprose with speed *the King of Men*'.

The 'up' should be viewed, not as compounded with 'rose', but as a detached adverb.

Without an adverb, the inversion can hardly be allowed; it occurs, however, in poetry:—

'*Smiled*, then, well pleased the aged man'. (Scott.)
'*Ceased* the high sound'. (Ib.)
'*Yelled* on the view the opening pack'. (Ib.)
'*Flashed* all their sabres bare'.

With an incomplete verb and complement, we may at any time invert the order, by prefixing the complement: '*blessed are* the poor in spirit'; '*short was* his joy'; '*cold is* Cadwallo's tongue'; '*sweet is* the breath of vernal showers'; '*inclosed is* a letter from——'; '*very civil* were the salutations on both sides'; '*bitter* but *unavailing were* my regrets'; '*many are* the *roofs* once thatched with reeds'; '*wise are* all his ways'.

'*A traveller* to thee unknown,
Is he that calls'.

The foregoing examples amount to a complete inversion of the Subject and Predicate of the Sentence; an inversion often demanded in composition both for clearness and for strength. It is usually quite easy when the predicate is an incomplete verb completed by an adjective, as in the instances last given. When the completing word is a noun, the expression is ambiguous. In saying 'the commander was the grand-master', we distinguish subject and predicate solely by the order.

As examples free from ambiguity, take the following: '*Prophet of evil* I ever am to myself'; '*Childe Harold* was he hight'; '*Merry brides* are we'; '*Victories* indeed they were'.

'No boding maid of skill divine
Art thou!'

It is not a regular construction to begin with an adverb, or even an adverbial phrase. There are many circumstances that render it frequently appropriate, as will be seen more particularly afterwards. The natural place of the adverb is immediately before or immediately after the verb, the subject being first of all: 'he *boldly* seized the oar, and rowed *vehemently*'. In placing the adverb first, we often become rhetorical or figurative, and it is then better to make the inversion thorough: '*boldly* did he seize'.

Under the Pronoun were pointed out cases where the grammatical subject is a neuter pronoun—'it', 'this'—standing as a provisional anticipation of the real subject or fact predicated about, which comes after the predicate in the form of an infinitive phrase. In such cases the predicate is usually short, and less important than the subject (inf.). The formal predication being thus lightly disposed of, the main attention is free for the consideration of the logical subject. Farther exemplification is not necessary here.

But there may be added a few examples where the infinitive as subject follows the predicate, the anticipating pronoun being absent.

'Him booteth not *resist*, nor succour *call*'. *(Faery Queen.)*

'As good *dissemble* that thou never mean'st,
As first *mean* truth and then *dissemble* it'.
(Marlowe.)

'Better *dwell* in the midst of alarms
Than *reign* in this horrible place'. (Cowper.)

'Best *stand* upon our guard'. *(Tempest.)*

'Far better with the dead *to be*
Than *live* thus nothing now to thee'. (Byron.)

'Theirs not *to reason* why, &c.

Under the Pronoun were also mentioned instances where a neuter pronoun anticipates the noun clause. In formal grammar, the pronoun is the subject, the clause being looked upon as an apposition; logically, however, the clause is subject. It is but seldom that the clause follows the predicate in the absence of the anticipating pronoun.

OBJECT AND VERB.

It is not easy in our language to place the object in advance; there being a clash between it and the subject, we are uncertain which is which:

'And all the air a solemn stillness holds'.

It is by this construction that we can practise oracular ambiguity: 'the *duke* yet lives that *Henry* shall depose'.

'When riseth Lacedæmon's hardihood,
When *Thebes* (subj.) Epaminondas (obj.) rears again—'

Here it is not obvious which is subject.

If there were a rule to place the subject always first, the doubt would be prevented. But the instances of the inversion, which occurs chiefly in poetry, do not adhere to any order.

Apart from the meaning or context, inversion is admissible when either the subject or the object is a pronoun:—'their hundred arms *they* wave'; 'such a changed France have *we*'; 'two men *I* honour, and no third'.

'Night, and all her sickly dews,
Her spectres wan, and birds of boding cry
He gives to range the dreary sky'.

'Silver and gold have *I* none, but such as I have give *I* thee'; '*me he* restored unto mine office, and *him he* hanged'; 'every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment *thou* shalt condemn'; 'one thing *thou* lackest'; 'so towards old Sylvanus *they her* bring'.

Another case is when the subject and the object are not of the same number, and when the verb shows the number; 'time works wonders', might be 'time wonders works', 'wonders time works'.

We may not say 'the heavens and the earth God created'; but we might say 'the heavens and the earth God governs.'

'With joy I see
The different doom our Fates assign'.
'Hark, his hands the lyre explore'.
'Some pious drops the closing eye requires'.
'Such evils sin hath wrought'.
'For me, the mine a thousand treasures brings'.
'In vain the spring my senses greets'.

The Imperative readily allows of the placing of the object first: 'once again *my call* obey'; 'the rich *repast* prepare'; '*praise* to the Lord give ye'; 'the *doors* wide open fling'; 'cease then, nor order imperfection *name*'; 'wait the great teacher Death, and God *adore*'; 'to him thy *woes*, thy *wishes* bring'; '*Him* serve with mirth, his *praise* forth tell'; 'these *things* command and teach'; '*them* that sin rebuke before all'.

When the object is expressed in the form of an infinitive or of a clause, it is somewhat heavy for the opening of the sentence. Still, emphasis not unfrequently brings it forward, especially in the clause form: '*how the truth came to the prophet* he himself knew not'; '*what I did* I did in honour'; '*where her father's grave was* no one knew'; '*at what time Sokrates relinquished his profession as a statuary* we do not know'.

The following shows what is aimed at in placing the object before the verb: 'neither *force* do I worship in Cromwell, nor arbitrary power'. The intention of the writer seems to be to make 'force' and 'arbitrary power' emphatic by position; the one being placed first, and the other last, in the sentence. The example might be variously turned: 'not force do I worship in Cromwell, nor yet arbitrary power'. There is emphasis, moreover, in the following uninverted arrangement—'I worship in Cromwell neither force nor arbitrary power'. Or, by a different inversion, starting with the adverbial phrase: 'In Cromwell I worship——'.

Another use of inversion is to make a closer connection

with the preceding sentence or clause. The demonstrative adjectives usually assist in this effect.

'If there be one function more than another which seems proper to a king, it is that of maintaining and asserting the independence of his realm; yet *this function* Christ peremptorily declined to undertake'.

'To render the exertions of this body effective, the greatest abilities were required in the emperor. *These abilities* Charles V. possessed'.

'My lord, his throat is cut; *that* I did for him'.

NOUN AND ADJECTIVE.

By a fortunate convention of our language, the simple adjective goes before the noun. This is the arrangement that is scientifically the most defensible. Before a thing is named, the mind should be prepared with all the qualifications and limitations, so as to conceive the thing at once as qualified and limited. 'A white rose' is better than 'a rose white', as in thinking of the rose we already clothe it with the white colour, instead of thinking of it first as red perhaps, and then having to change to white. (See ENGLISH COMPOSITION AND RHETORIC, p. 47.)

To place the simple adjective after the noun makes an elegant poetical variety. It is a frequent mannerism of Milton: 'Cambuscan *bold*'; 'mantle *blue*'; 'that light *unutterable*'; 'many a region *dolorous*'; 'of depth *immeasurable*'; 'those armies *bright*'.

Other examples: 'the waters *wide*' (Byron); 'his father *old*' (M. Arnold); 'her sea-cave *dim*'; 'above the surges *hoar*'; 'Cocytus *slow*'; 'horror *hideous*'; 'error *blind*'; 'danger *imminent*'; 'a virgin *desolate*'.

'Next after her, the winged God himself
Came riding on a lion *ravenous*,
Taught to obey the menage of that elf
That man and beast, with power *imperious*,
Subdueth to his kingdom *tyrannous*'. (Spenser.)

There are a few expressions where the inverted order is

all but invariable: 'Poet *Laureate*', 'governor-*general*', 'lord *paramount*', 'knight *errant*', 'States *General*', 'court martial', 'body politic', 'notary public', 'sign-manual', 'Theatre Royal', 'letters patent', 'time immemorial', 'heirs male', 'bride elect'.

Compare also these: 'Lord-lieutenant', 'Queen- or duchess-dowager', 'Knight Templar', 'Lord Marcher'. The nouns have very much the function of the adjective.

Two or more adjectives are not unfrequently placed after the same noun: 'across the meadows *bare* and *brown*'; 'thirty steeds, both *fleet* and *wight*'; 'his short falchion, *sharp* and *clear*'; 'his wife, *stout*, *ruddy*, and *dark-brow'd*, of silver brooch and bracelet *proud*'; 'gods *partial*, *changeful*, *passionate*, *unjust*'.

When there are two nouns in close proximity, each qualified by an adjective, the poets are fond of variety in the order of the adjectives. The following are examples:—

'Yet held her *wrathful* hand from vengeance *sore*' (Spenser); '(the lightning) with *dreadful* force falls on some steeple *high*' (Spenser); '*fruitful* Ceres and Lyæus *fat*' (Spenser); 'the *still* morn went out with sandals *gray*' (Milton); 'to-morrow to *fresh* woods and pastures *new*'; '*fix'd* fate, *free* will, foreknowledge *absolute*'; 'by *wasting* plague, by tortures *slow*' (Scott); 'with *brawling* threat, and clamour *vain*'; 'his *withered* cheek and tresses *gray*'.

'Ne ever is he wont on aught to feed
But toads and frogs, his pasture *poisonous*,
Which in his *cold* complexion do breed
A *filthy* blood, or humour *rancorous*.
Matter of doubt and dread *suspicious*,
That doth with *cureless* care consume the heart,
Corrupts the stomach with gall *vicious*,
Cross-cuts the liver with *internal* smart,
And doth transfix the soul with death's *eternal* dart'.
(Spenser.)

Also *Faery Queen*, I. 1, 8 and 9.

When an adjective is loaded with adjuncts of its own, it has often to be placed last: 'the lowest races of men can-

not form a system *worthy of the name of religion* ; 'the mountain *wooded to the peak*'; 'all the details *requisite for the house of a moderate gentleman*'; 'voices *high in altercation* were repeatedly heard within the room'; 'no casuist, however *severe*, has denied this'; 'obstacles somewhat more *serious*'; 'a plant *proper* to almost all soils'; 'a man *wise* in his own conceit'; 'an incident *worth* lingering on'.

Of the other forms of noun adjunct, the possessive case comes uniformly first; while the prepositional phrase almost uniformly follows the noun. The participle restrictive follows, the participle co-ordinating very often precedes, but oftener follows, the noun. The adjective clause comes after the noun. Examples of all these are abundant in every kind of composition.

Easy adjuncts are placed first; long or complicated adjuncts come after the noun, which is not willing to be too much suspended. Our usage compares favourably with the German usage, which would strike us as intolerably clumsy. 'Ein *durch Zufall von einem Unbekannten aus einer groszen Lebensgefahr geretteter* Mann' is, literally, 'A *by-accident by-a-stranger from-imminent-peril saved* man': "A man *saved accidentally by a stranger from imminent peril*". So, 'Dieser *über alle Erwartung gelungene* Erfolg'—'This *beyond all expectation successful* result'—'This result *successful beyond all expectation*': we might go as far as 'This *surprisingly successful result*'.

Mr. Earle (Philosophy of the English Tongue, § 556, 2nd edition) quotes examples of the influence of the German construction on English authors. The absurd extreme is instanced in Thackeray—'The, *I believe of Eastern derivation*, monosyllable 'Bosh'".

The number or the importance of the adjuncts may be such as to cause difficulty in the arrangement. A good method of relieving these cases is to give at once what qualifications can be satisfactorily given, and then to repeat the subject or an equivalent to support the remaining adjuncts.

'Many objections have been made to a proposition which,

in some remarks of mine on translating Homer, I ventured to put forth; A PROPOSITION *about criticism, and its importance at the present day*'. (M. Arnold.)

'I make the arrest—I, *Henry Bohun, Earl of Essex, Lord High Constable of England*'.

'Thus it was that a traitor to the aristocracy had obtained the government of part of Spain, and had sworn to bring over his troops to the support of the Catilinarians; A DANGER *which had* been only [misplaced] averted from the Government by his premature and suspicious death'. (Merivale.)

'Corresponding to these statements is another, which represents Sokrates as one whose special merit it was to have rescued the Athenian mind from such demoralizing influences;—A REPUTATION *which he neither deserves nor requires*'. (Grote.)

'It is remarkable that in 440 B.C. a law was passed forbidding comic authors to ridicule any citizen by name in their compositions; *which prohibition*, however, was rescinded after two years; AN INTERVAL *marked by the rare phenomenon of a lenient comedy from Kratinus*'.

There is no special rule for these complicated adjuncts. The entire sentence has to be viewed in the light of those principles that guide us in disposing of qualifying circumstances generally.

The three first, or the first three?

I here append some farther examples bearing on these two forms.

The meaning to be expressed is, bring me the first, second, and third of a row; or bring me all from the first to the third. Desiring a shorter mode of statement, we are accustomed to say, 'the first three', or 'the three first'; neither of the forms admitting of being construed strictly.

The following occurs in Mätzner:—'In connection with *first* and *other*, the cardinal number is found before or after: 'The *four first* acts' (Sheridan, *Critic*, I. 1); 'For the *first ten* minutes' (Cooper, *Spy*, 13); '*Four other* children' (Lewes, *Goethe*, I. 18); '*Other seven* days' (Gen. viii. 12).'

The preference of grammarians is for the 'first three'; with regard to the 'three first' they ask, how can three be first? The only answer is to retort that the 'first three' is inapplicable to the first, second, and third of a single file; it supposes a line of three abreast.

We find in good use such expressions as these: 'the *two highest* men'; 'the *two succeeding* chapters'; 'the *two next* candidates'. Of a work brought out in two volumes, a critic said—'the *two best* volumes of light reading that have appeared this year'; this would have been a case for 'the *best two* volumes'.

Gibbon says of the history of Rome:—'The *seven first* centuries were filled with a succession of triumphs'. This is hardly to be imitated; no more can we commend 'the *first seven* centuries'. Better avoid the form altogether: 'For seven centuries (from the first) the history was a succession of triumphs'.

The Article.

So important is the rule for repeating, or not repeating, the article before a second noun, that I give additional examples.

'Wanted *a* nurse and housemaid' means that the same person is to be both. If two persons are wanted, one for each office, the article should be repeated.

'By *the* day or week', being supposed to mean an alternative of two periods, should be—'by *the* day or *the* week'. 'The day or week' might mean that the names 'day' and 'week' were names for the same thing.

'The Town and County bank' signifies one bank combining town business and county business.

It is not correct to say—'town and county orders attended to', if there are two distinct classes of orders. It should be—'Attention is given to orders both from the town and from the country'. Or repeat the noun, 'town orders and country orders'.

'A virtuous and excellent people' is a proper way of describing the same people as virtuous and excellent.

Compare now the two following: 'She is the sweetest-tempered, honestest, worthiest, young creature'. (Fielding.) 'Dare any soul breathe a word against *the* sweetest, *the* tenderest, *the* most angelical of young women?' (Thackeray.) Mätzner accounts for the repetition in the second instance thus: 'The reason is to bring the object emphatically forward after its different qualifications'. A good example of the same emphasis occurs in Macaulay: 'Of these pamphlets, *the* longest, *the* bitterest, and *the* ablest was commonly ascribed to Ferguson'. One pamphlet is spoken of.

'They possessed both *the* civil and criminal jurisdiction'. (Hume.) Say 'both *the* civil and *the* criminal jurisdiction', giving the article to each subject. So 'the civil and '*the*' ecclesiastical administration'. (Macaulay.)

'*The* lunatic, *the* lover, and *the* poet,
Are of imagination all compact'.

Three different classes, each taking the article.

'Alike *the* busy and *the* gay
But flutter through life's little day,
In fortune's varying colours drest'.

'*The* pursuers and pursued entered the gates together'. The contrast requires the repetition of the article: *the* pursuers and '*the*' pursued.

Again—'James was declared *a* mortal and bloody enemy, *a* tyrant, *a* murderer, and *a* usurper'. We cannot be mistaken here; there are several predicates for the same subject 'James'. The case would be different if one were to say—'They found *a* mortal and bloody enemy, *a* tyrant, &c. The hearer would certainly suppose that the writer meant more than one person.

'*The* elder and younger son . . . . were, like *the* gentleman and lady in the weather-box, never at home together'. (Thackeray.) Properly: *the* elder and '*the*' younger son; *the* gentleman and '*the*' lady.

'*A* loyal gentry and priesthood'. (Macaulay.) Except for great emphasis, we should scarcely say '*a loyal* gentry and *a loyal* priesthood'. Otherwise, 'a gentry and priesthood both loyal'.

'On the white corner square marked 64 place *a* rook or castle'. The article is not repeated, 'rook' and 'castle' being names, not of different things, but of the same thing.

So, 'On the distant mainland is seen *the* town or village of Stromness'.

'What is *the* use and object of building pinnacles?' (Helps.)

'*The* Æmilian and Flaminian highways' is allowable in the sense of 'The Æmilian highway and the Flaminian highway': a considerable shortening of the expression. Similarly, '*the* fourteenth and fifteenth centuries', '*the* Danish and Saxon tongues', '*the* thirteenth and fourteenth Iliads'. Macaulay expresses the same meaning otherwise, in '*The* hereditary and *the* elective branch of the Legislature'. According to the foregoing instances, he might have written '*The* hereditary and elective branches'. Had he given '*The* hereditary and *the* elective branches', this would have implied a plurality both of hereditary branches and of elective branches.

As a rule the Article precedes another adjective joined to the same noun: as '*a* good man', '*the* wisest man'. But there are a few adjectives that precede the article: '*What a* pity!' '*What a* grace was seated on this brow!' '*What a* precious puppy!' '*Such an* act'; '*such a* deed'; 'on *such a* tranquil night as this'. '*Many a* man'; 'full *many a* gem'; 'how does your honour for this *many a* day?' '*Half an* hour'; '*half a* pound'.

When the other adjective is modified by certain adverbs of degree, it goes before the article: '*so excellent a* king', '*so difficult a* task', '*so hopeless an* undertaking'; '*how serious a* case', '*how beautiful a* river', '*how strongly fortified a* town it is'; '*too severe a* sentence', '*too long a* sermon'; '*all the* mountains', '*all the* ills of life', '*all the* wisdom of the ancients'; '*both the* hands', '*both the* steamers were injured'; '*half, double, triple the* number', or 'the quantity'.

For the singular we say '*many a* man', which gives the plural '*many* men'. But the form '*a many* men' occurs; more frequently, however, in older than in recent compositions. Some have suggested that 'many' is not an adjec-

tive here, but a noun; yet, in a '*a few* Coltic, and *a* still *fewer* Latin, words' (Freeman), we see a like construction, and 'few' seems to be accepted as an adjective. '*A great many* objections' is common enough; Thackeray uses 'a pretty many': 'the Catholic gentry, of whom there were *a pretty many* in the country and neighbouring city' '*A many* parties', in the mouth of Mrs. Toosypegs (*Verdant Green*); '*a many* things' in the mouth of Mrs. Poyser (*Adam Bede*); and similar instances from Mrs. Holt (*Felix Holt*), and the turnkey's daughter (Thackeray)—seem to relegate this form to the vulgar speech.

Even the auxiliary verbs must follow the rule of repetition: 'Man should glorify God, and *should* enjoy him for ever'. 'They will admit that he was a great poet, but 'they will' deny that he was a great man'.

'Be' should not do duty first as incomplete verb, and then as auxiliary. It should be repeated. 'The Doctor *was* a very great favourite, and received with much respect and honour'. (Thackeray.) Say '*was* received'. 'Waste *are* those pleasant farms, and the farmers for ever departed'. (Longfellow.)

The principle extends to PREPOSITIONS. 'Journal kept in France and (in) Italy'. The omission of the second 'in' is excused solely on the ground that we cannot be misled into supposing France and Italy the same subject. 'Man's chief end is to glorify God, and *to* enjoy him for ever'. 'This served rather to perplex than *to* undeceive him'; 'These events belong more to Roman than '*to*' British story'. (Hume.)

'Macaulay's two essays on Milton and Machiavelli' suggests two essays, both on the two authors combined. There are various ways, though perhaps more cumbrous, of shewing that one essay is on Milton, and the other on Machiavelli. Some improvement is effected by repeating the preposition; we might farther append the word 'respectively'.

'Had John inherited the great qualities *of* his father, *of*

Henry Beauclerc, or *of* the conqueror, &c.' (Macaulay.) If the repeated *of*s were omitted, the meaning would be very misleading, or at least ambiguous, to such as are not acquainted with the facts from other sources.

'The Sabbath was regarded as a day *for* rest from worldly occupation and holy joy'. One might be excused for supposing at first reading that the writer means 'rest *from* holy joy' as well as 'rest *from* worldly occupation'. The repetition of 'for' is necessary: 'a day *for* rest from worldly occupation and *for* holy joy'.

'He sympathized not *with* their cause, but their fate'. (Lytton.) 'Not' and 'but' here contrast two positions, which should be expressed similarly: 'not *with* their cause, but '*with*' their fate' is far more satisfactory.

'Wise women choose not husbands *for* the eye, merit, or birth, but wealth and sovereignty'. (Ben Jonson.) Here again is a contrast between positions. 'For' should be repeated at least before 'wealth': 'not *for* certain grounds, (which are obviously different from each other without 'for' before each), but '*for*' certain other grounds'. To gain emphasis, however, 'for' may be placed before each ground of choice, 'wealth and sovereignty' being so closely related as to be reckoned a single ground: 'Wise women choose husbands, not *for* the eye, '*for*' merit, or '*for*' birth, but '*for*' wealth and sovereignty'.

'The bursting *of* the Mississippi Scheme and South-Sea Bubble'. The omission of the article before 'South-Sea' and of the preposition 'of' before the article, as well as the application of 'bursting' to both 'Scheme' and 'Bubble', render the meaning unnecessarily doubtful. Say 'The *failure of* the Mississippi Scheme and '*the*' *bursting* '*of the*' South-Sea Bubble'.

Macaulay deserves special commendation for clearness and emphasis gained by means of the repetition of the preposition: 'Amidst the cares of state the King retained his passion *for* music, *for* reading, *for* writing, *for* literary society': 'Avowed dissent was punished *by* imprisonment, *by* ignominious exposure, *by* cruel mutilations, and *by* ruinous

fines'. The separate agencies are emphatically singled out by the repetition of the preposition.

'He [William of Orange] was proved *by* every test: *by* war, *by* wounds, *by* painful and depressing maladies, *by* raging seas, *by* the imminent and constant risk of assassination'. Here again special attention is called to the different agencies working at different times; the repetition of the preposition is peculiarly emphatic.

Obverse couples are to be understood as one subject, unless there be some specific separation. 'The rule of right and wrong' is the correct way of stating the rule that settles what is right and what is wrong. 'It is not a question of pleasure and pain'. 'The theory of heat and cold' is equivalent to the theory of the variation of temperature, and is one subject. 'The feeling of approbation and disapprobation' is the same subject, unless we mean to make one discussion respecting approbation and another respecting disapprobation.

'By observation and experiment' means the appeal to facts generally, as opposed to deductive inference apart from facts. If we are to draw a line between making observations and making experiments, which are distinct modes of appealing to facts, we should repeat the preposition: 'by observations and *by* experiments'.

'Persons are prohibited from *riding or driving* cattle on the footpath'. Rather—'No one is allowed either to ride on horseback, or to drive cattle on the footpath'; 'It is not allowed to drive cattle, or to ride, on the footpath'. 'Riding on horseback and driving cattle are both forbidden on the footpath'.

So with CONJUNCTIONS: 'These emigrants were always ready to take the field against the Christians, both *as* a religious duty and *as* a means of acquiring slaves'. 'He lives in the family rather *as* a relation, than *as* a dependant'. (Addison.)

PRONOUN AND ANTECEDENT.

It is a sound rule that the Relative should be as close as possible to the Antecedent. Between the relative and the antecedent there should not be any word that might usurp the rights of the antecedent.

'I gave him a piece of bread, *which* he ate'. We know of course that 'which' refers, on the rule of prominence, to 'piece'; 'of bread' being a mere adjunct to define the nature of 'piece'.

'I must not forget the two sons of this aspiring citizen, *who* came to church in a dashing curricle'. Without the context, we cannot be quite certain, although we may think it highly probable, that 'who' refers not to the near noun 'citizen', but to the prominent noun 'sons'. The possessive —'*citizen's* two sons, *who*'—would remove all doubt.

Sometimes the subject and the clause adjunct are separated by the predicate. In these cases, the subject is often a pronoun; the predicate is usually short: 'He is well paid *that* is well satisfied'; '*he* lives long *that* lives well'; 'that *it* might be fulfilled *which* was spoken by Esaias the prophet'.

> '. . . . *I* cannot blame thee,
> *Who* am myself attack'd with weariness,
> . . . . . *he* is drown'd
> *Whom* thus we stray to find'. (*Tempest.*)

'Shall *I* of a surety bear a child, *which* am old?' (Gen. xviii. 13.)

In cases where the clause is co-ordinate, the relative may sometimes be advantageously resolved. 'I cannot blame thee, *for I* myself am weary'; 'shall I of a surety bear a child, *seeing that I* am old?' If the resolution be inconvenient, some other device may be open to us. In the last example, we may read: 'Shall *I*, *which* am old, of a surety bear a son?'

'The *time* drew near at *which* the Houses must re-assemble'. (Macaulay.) An easy inversion will serve here: 'Now drew

near the *time when* (= at which) the Houses must re-assemble'.

'Two languid *campaigns* followed, during *which* neither army did anything memorable'. In imitation of the preceding example we may say: 'Then followed two languid *campaigns*, during *which*, &c'.

'About ten thousand picked and veteran *soldiers* were thus obtained, of *which* the Duke of Alva was appointed general-in-chief'. (Motley.) There is nothing specially objectionable in this particular instance; but the predicate could easily be transferred to the beginning: 'Thus (there) were obtained about ten thousand . . . . . soldiers, of *which* &c'. Besides bringing relative and antecedent closer, we have probably brought this sentence into nearer connection with the foregoing by the prominence of 'thus'.

A similar change produces a similar double effect in the next example:

'All *evils* here contaminate the mind.

That opulence departed leaves behind'. (Goldsmith.)

'Here', placed in the beginning, connects this statement very pointedly with what precedes; the predicate comes next naturally; and then 'all *evils*' gets into contact with its relative adjunct.

(Other similar cases will appear under PLACING OF ADVERB.)

The antecedent is sometimes awkwardly implied in a possessive case that is not close to the relative. The possessive is often pronominal.

'This way will direct you to *a gentleman's* house *that* hath skill to take off these burdens' (*Pilgrim's Progress*). Correct to this: 'to *the* house *of a gentleman that* hath skill'.

'Nor better was *their* lot *who* fled'. (Scott). Changed: 'Nor better was the lot of *them that* fled'.

'Why then *their* loss deplore *that* are not lost?' (Young.) '*The* loss *of them that* are not lost'.

'I am *his* first born-son *that* was the last

That wore the imperial diadem of Rome'. (*Tit. Andron.*)

'*The* first-born son *of him that* &c.'.

'*His* praise is lost *who* stays till all commend'. (Pope.) '*The* praise *awarded by him that stays* &c'.

'But that verbal questions, if treated as verbal questions, and not mistaken for what they are not, may lead to the most useful results, *I* need not express *my* conviction, *who* have compiled the following observations for the sake of explaining the signification of political words'. (G. C. Lewis.)

The following example, though perfectly grammatical, is felt to be very awkward: 'The King marched from Exeter into Cornwall, *which* having pacified, he returned to Winchester'. Better '*which* he pacified; he *then* returned to Winchester': or '*and* having pacified *this county*, he returned'.

'They leave us
The dangers, the repulses, judgments, wants;
Which how long will you bear?' (Ben Jonson.)

A daring inversion. The relative is close upon the antecedent; but objection may be taken to the position of the interrogative word after it. Yet the infrequency of the construction gives it great emphasis; and we may regard it as a sudden and direct rhetorical stroke for '*which* you will surely not bear much longer'.

'So glister'd the dire snake, and into fraud
Led Eve, our credulous mother, &c.
Which when she saw, thus to her guide she spake'.

The Latin construction *Quæ quum, &c.* is apt to get translated in this form, which is not common, and should not be encouraged.

'Patriots obtained a recognition of certain immunities, called political liberties or rights, *which* it was to be regarded as a breach of duty in the ruler to infringe, and *which* if he did infringe, specific resistance, or general rebellion, was held to be justifiable'. (J. S. Mill.) A serious case. The first 'which' is suspended over a complicated clause till we at last reach its governing verb 'infringe'; the second 'which', here, as in the preceding case, object and first word of an adverbial clause, is felt to fit into the sentence differently from what the reader expects. 'Say——liberties

or rights, infraction of *which* by the ruler was to be regarded as a breach of duty (on his part), justifying specific resistance or general rebellion'.

In examples such as the following, where the relative clause comes before the formal antecedent, or has not any expressed antecedent, the order is quite exceptional. It can appear only in passages that are highly wrought, mostly poetical. And in every case, the antecedent, even when it is formally brought in after the clause, is understood and mentally supplied before the relative.

'*Who* overcomes
By force, hath overcome but half his foe'. (Milton.)

'*Who* wickedly is wise, or madly brave,
Is but the more a fool, the more a knave.
Who noble ends by noble means obtains,
. . . . . .
. . *that man* is great indeed'. (Pope.)

PLACING OF THE ADVERB.

The Adverb, Adverbial Phrase, and Adverbial Clause, include the larger number of qualifying adjuncts, and bring to view all the delicate considerations respecting Order of Words.

PROXIMITY, viewed as a condition of Order, allows the qualifying word to be placed either before or after. Very often the Adverb is, for convenience, placed after the verb or other member affected, especially if it ends the sentence. 'He quenched the rebellion *speedily*'; 'he issued a proclamation *first of all*'. The adverb must be referred back to the verb with its object, or to the action—'quenching the rebellion'. At the end of a sentence, or of part of a sentence, the qualifying word is not in danger of being referred to something coming after.

Again, when an action is beset with numerous adjuncts, these adjuncts need to be divided and distributed partly before and partly after the verb. Speaking of a river in its course, Helps describes it as 'flowing with equable current

(1) busily (2) by great towns (3)'. Here are three adjuncts all thrown to the end; but a division might be made, and one at least taken before the verb—'*with equable current* flowing busily by great towns'.

Proximity secures the desired end, provided the adjuncts are so placed that they cannot be referred to any other subject than the one intended; a provision not always easy to make good.

The law of PRIORITY rests upon certain distinct and important considerations. The first is that, on the most general principle of construction, the qualification should precede the thing qualified. In our language, this is the usage with the adjective, and to a considerable extent with the adverb. Hence, if a qualification lies between two words, and is not specially excluded from the one that precedes the mere principle of Order would make us refer it to the one that follows; we always by preference look forward.

Another important circumstance connected with Priority is that a qualifying adjunct bears upon all that follows, until there is a break. It is not simply the word or phrase immediately following, but the entire group of circumstances up to the end of the sentence, or at least to a comma pause.

Special instances of single-word Adverbs.

The single-word adverbs that are most frequently misplaced, are 'only' and 'not'. There are some others that often give trouble, as 'never', 'even', 'always', 'enough', (phrase) 'at least'.

ONLY. 'The 'Spirit of Laws' was *only* completed when the author was sixty years of age, and after he had spent on it twenty years of toil'. The 'only' is not meant to operate on the verb 'completed', but on the adjuncts that follow. Say 'was completed *only* when the author was sixty years of age ——'. But in a sentence of this kind

another form is preferable: 'was not completed until the author was sixty years of age, he having spent upon it twenty years of toil'.

Speaking of a party ascending a mountain in Switzerland, a writer says—'The first two named *only* ascended to the summit'; that is, they did no more than ascend to the summit, the others ascending higher than the summit. 'Of the party, two *alone* went to the summit'; 'the summit was gained by *only* two'.

'For fifty miles, the river could (*only*) be distinguished from the ocean 'only' by its calmness and discoloured water'.

'Speculative truth is (*only*) pursued, and is (*only*) held of value, 'only' for the sake of intellectual activity'.

'The crown of the three kingdoms can (*only*) be worn 'only' by a protestant'.

'One practice, however, can be reformed, (that of) 'namely', giving prizes and commendations *only* [correctly placed] to (those who) 'such as' get on the fastest'.

The intimation printed on the Post Cards contains apparently a misplacement of 'only'. 'The address *only* to be written on this side'. The composer probably thought that 'only' would qualify 'address' by being placed after it. This would be very well at the end—'On this side you are to write the address *only*'. But in tracing the operation of a qualifying adjunct, we must in the first instance look forward; and here we find a verb immediately following, to which the 'only' most readily applies. The fair rendering is that whatever may be done with the address on the other side (it may be *printed*, for example), on this side it can only be *written*. The real meaning requires us to isolate 'address', by putting it to the end, and prefixing 'only'. 'On this side to be written *only the address*'. 'On this side write nothing but the address'. 'Nothing is to be written on this side but the address'. 'Write the address on this side and nothing more'. Or with 'alone': 'The address *alone* to be written on this side'.

In the postal card of Germany, 'only' is placed so as to

modify 'the address': 'Auf die Vorderseite ist *nur* die Adresse zu schreiben'.

It is not at all uncommon to expect people to refer 'only' to a previous word; the more so, that, in speaking, we can obviate the ambiguity by emphasis. By emphatically pronouncing '*I only* am to blame', with a pause after 'only', we can show that the restriction intended by 'only' is to 'I'. But in composition the safe rule is to place the subject to be restricted after the 'only'; 'the blame falls *only* on me', 'on me *alone*'.

As a parallel instance, observe the placing of 'first' in this passage. 'Queen Anne was not partial to Austria. She *first* weakened the friendship existing between the two countries by abandoning the Grand Alliance, and forming a separate peace with France'. The operation of 'first' may be either backward upon 'she', or forward upon the rest of the sentence. The meanings are quite different. The one would be—'She was the first to weaken the friendship'; the other is—'the first thing she did was to weaken the friendship'. There may also be a difference of meaning according as 'first' sweeps the whole sentence, or is restricted to 'weakening the friendship existing between the two countries'. If there be a restriction of this kind, the two infinitive phrases should precede, thus: 'By abandoning the Grand Alliance and 'by' forming a separate peace with France, she was the first to weaken [if that be the sense] the friendship between Austria and France'.

'The public are admitted to these grounds on Friday *only* between 2 and 5'. The intention is to confine the admission to three hours in the week, from two to five on Friday. If we study the placing of the adjuncts, we find that the public are excluded on Fridays on all hours except those three; but there is nothing to exclude them in any other day of the week. Better give it the positive form, thus: 'The public are admitted to view the grounds on Fridays, from two to five'. This sufficiently excludes them at all other times, and is a more gracious form, as stating permission, and only implying restriction.

'He *only* came home yesterday', is hardly worth changing to 'he came home *only* yesterday'.. There is something gained by interposing before 'came home' the intended qualification. We expect after the verb a simple unqualified date—'he came yesterday, last Tuesday'. When the meaning is that he might have been much sooner but did not actually arrive till yesterday, there is a want of some qualification prefixed. 'He did *not* come *till* yesterday', is the full expression, but rather long and formal for colloquial address.

The following passage is left to the reader's ingenuity. In every instance but one, 'only' is misplaced:—

'We can *only* know a substance through its qualities, but also, we can *only* know qualities as inhering in a substance. Substance and attribute are correlative, and can *only* be thought together: the knowledge of each, therefore, is relative to the other; but need not be, and indeed is not, relative to us. For we know attributes as they are in themselves, and our knowledge of them is *only* relative inasmuch as attributes have *only* a relative existence. It is relative knowledge in a sense not contradictory to absolute. It is an absolute knowledge, though of things which *only* exist in a necessary relation to another thing called a substance'.

NOT. On the general principle of priority, 'not' must be taken as qualifying all that follows to the first break;

> '*Not* in the regions
> Of horrid hell, can come a devil more damn'd
> In evils, to top Macbeth'.

The negation in the following sentence comes in so late as to be a surprise. 'We have, for the age of Sulla, as for so many other important periods of history, *no* one consecutive contemporary narrative'. 'For the age of Sulla, as for so many other important periods of history, we *do not possess* one consecutive contemporary narrative'. 'As of so many other important periods of history, so of the age of Sulla, we do not possess—'. 'As is the case with so many other important periods of history, we do not possess one consecutive contemporary narrative of the age of Sulla'.

'They have *no* share in *all* that's done
Beneath the circuit of the sun'.

Here the 'no' is placed so as to command 'share' with all its qualifications. This is quite right. There is, however, an insufficiency in the word 'all' as here used. The interpretation is that 'they (the dead) share in some or many things done, but not in all'. The proper word is 'aught' for anything; 'not anything' is thorough exclusion. 'They *do not* share in *aught* that's done'.

The following are a few miscellaneous examples of single-word adverbs.

'There is no subject that wants to be *more* kept within bounds'. Better 'that *more* wants to be kept within bounds'. The word 'more' qualifies not the narrower action 'kept within bounds', but the wider action 'wants to be kept'.

'He informs me that he has *never* seen *some* of the branches of the red-deer horns brought into action'. The author apparently means that while he *has* seen some branches brought into action, there are others that he has never seen brought into action; but, by the place of the 'never', it is implied that he has not seen any. 'There are *some* branches that he has *never* seen brought into action'.

'But' is not very liable to misplacement: 'we are (*but*) young 'but' once'. (Thackeray.)

It is otherwise with 'even': 'The common people seem (*even*) to have enjoyed 'even' more liberty among them than among the natives of Gaul'. (Hume.) ''Even' the convenience of feeding their cattle was (*even*) a sufficient motive for removing their seats'.

'Enough' is specially understood to follow the word it modifies: 'good *enough*', 'not seriously *enough*'.

'A tear *at least* is due to the unhappy'. 'At least' is intended to qualify 'tear'; and we are pretty well accustomed to refer this phrase to the word going before. Yet there would be more precision and certainty in the arrangement—'To the unhappy is due (we owe to the unhappy) *at least* a tear'.

Placing of Adverbs generally.

'He led his army skilfully through the passes'. Take 'skilfully' forward: 'he skilfully led his army through the passes'. 'Skilfully (with skill) he led his army ——'.

'Damon is mentioned by Plato *generally* with much eulogy'. The adverb 'generally' is obviously meant to qualify 'with much eulogy' coming after, and so it does. Only it might also have a bearing upon the preceding phrase 'by Plato'. Moreover, the thing really to be qualified is 'mentioning with eulogy', and the adverb should precede and command the verb: 'Damon is *generally* mentioned with much eulogy by Plato'

'What is the effect on the note of tightening the string?' A very awkward arrangement of phrases. 'What effect does tightening the string have upon the note?' 'How is the note affected by tightening the string?' 'When the string is tightened, what is the effect on the note?'

'A house to let, furnished' is not a happy arrangement. Better say—'To let, a furnished house'.

'For the Spaniards, though terrible visitors in other respects, did not at once create a famine in those parts which they occupied, *by reason of the comparative smallness of their numbers*'. The last clause is greatly misplaced. Being at the end, it must be supposed to qualify what immediately precedes, namely, the relative clause, 'which they occupied'. We find, however, that it is meant to qualify 'did not create a famine, &c.' It should be brought in earlier, thus: 'For the Spaniards, though in other respects terrible visitors, *yet, by reason of the comparative smallness of their numbers*, did not at once create a famine in the parts occupied by them'.

Similarly: 'The French nation is not consoled for the misfortunes which it has endured *by the incidental triumph of justice in Italy*'. 'Consoled' is the word meant to be qualified.

'He looked and muttered in a way that could not but fill those whose life it was to watch him and obey him *with*

great alarm'. 'Fill' is to be qualified, not 'watch' or 'obey'.

'This was as well evidenced as a great many nearly as marvellous stories'; 'as a great many stories nearly as marvellous'.

'How well amidst all the cares of office Pitt retained through life his classic knowledge is shown among several other testimonies by one which Lord John Russell has recorded'. 'How well Pitt, amidst all the cares of office, through life retained his classical knowledge is shown by various testimonies, and among these by one that Lord John Russell has recorded'.

This is the title of a form used in municipal elections: 'Intimation by returning officer to candidate of his nomination'. There is some difficulty in avoiding this jumble caused by separating words from their grammatical connections, and by uniting those that are not connected. We might say—'Returning officer's intimation to candidates of their being nominated'. Or, 'Intimation to candidates, by the returning officer, of their being nominated'. Each of the three qualifications wants to be close to 'intimation'; one must be disappointed.

'Accustomed to a land *at home* where every height might prove a cathedral tower'. 'Accustomed at home to a *land where* every height——'.

Unnatural separations often arise in following out the regular order of a sentence. When the object is loaded with qualifying adjuncts, a short adverbial expression is not easily delayed till these are all given. 'We last night received a piece of ill news *at our club*, which very sensibly affected every one of us'. Transpose the adverbial phrase—'We last night received *at our club* a piece of ill news'. Or carrying the amendment still further—'Last night, at the club, we received a piece of ill news which sensibly affected us all'.

'He has visited several countries *as a public minister* where he formerly wandered as a gipsy'. 'He has visited as a public minister several countries where——'. 'As a public

minister he has visited several countries——'. 'Several countries, where he wandered as a gipsy, he has visited as a minister'.

'I had often received an invitation *from my friend Sir Roger de Coverley* to pass away a month with him in the country'. The phrase 'from my friend' is in one view rightly placed after 'invitation', and in another view it comes between the verbal noun and its adjunct 'to pass away'. Better, therefore, 'I had often received from my friend, &c., an invitation to pass away a month with him in the country'. 'My friend Sir Roger had often invited me to pass away——'.

In the following examples a short adverbial phrase is well placed between the verb and the object. 'He (William III.) had consulted *by letter* all the most eminent physicians of Europe'. We could not put 'by letter' at the end.

'They found *by my eating* that a small quantity would not suffice me'. (Gulliver.)

'Zeus has *around him* his council of the greater Gods'. (Freeman.) 'Zeus has his council of the greater Gods *around him*' would suggest a wrong meaning.

'He imparts *without reserve* secrets of the highest moment'. 'He explains *with perfect simplicity* vast designs affecting all the governments of Europe'.

'Shall not the street-preacher, if so minded, take *for the text of his sermon* the stones in the gutter?' (Thackeray).

'I feel *within me*
A peace above all earthly dignities,
A still and quiet conscience'.

The adverbial phrase is insignificant, and might be omitted without sensible loss; while the object draws to itself undivided attention.

An important and leading adverbial adjunct that, in the usual grammatical order, would come at the end of a clause or sentence, can with great propriety and force be brought to the beginning. This is one of the best known and most widely employed rhetorical inversions. The intention being

to qualify the entire clause, we but follow the greatest law of qualifying order, which is to make the qualification precede what is qualified.

'*With a great sum* obtained I this freedom'. Usual order —'I obtained this freedom with a great sum'. '*Once, and once only*, after his acquittal, he interfered (did he interfere) in politics'. (Macaulay—*Hastings.*)

'*Week in, week out, from morn to night*
You can hear his bellows blow'. (Longfellow.)

'*For the sake of your fame, for the sake of the civilization you have attained*, stifle not defenceless wretches in caverns'. (Jerrold.)

'*Now by your children's cradles, now by your father's graves*,
Be men to-day, Quirites, or be for ever slaves'.
(Macaulay.)

The negative adverbs 'not', 'never', are especially favoured with this position of emphatic qualification. '*Not* a muscle of his face moved. *Not* a sigh broke from him'. '*Not* a drum was heard'. '*Not* all the priests of Hymen, *not* all the incantations of the gods, can make it whole'.

'*Never, not even* under the tyranny of Laud, had the condition of the Puritans been so deplorable as at that time. *Never* had spies been so actively employed in detecting congregations. *Never* had magistrates, grand jurors, rectors, and churchwardens been so much on the alert'. (Macaulay.)

'*Never* did men live under such a crushing sense of degradation, *never* did they look back with more bitter regret, *never* were the vices that spring out of despair so rife, *never* was sensuality cultivated more methodically, *never* did poetry curdle so readily into satire, *never* was genius so much soured by cynicism, and *never* was calumny so abundant or so gross or so easily believed'. (*Ecce Homo.*)

The mere fact that the adverbial qualifications of a sentence are numerous, is a sufficient reason for placing at the commencement the one that most sweepingly qualifies the whole sentence. This is exemplified in the preceding instance, as well as in those given under the Inversion of Sub-

ject and Verb, (p. 295), and throughout the whole discussion of Order of Words.

The same arrangement also favours closeness of connection with a previous statement: 'The Queen was carried to Stirling; *there* she was (was she) safe'. 'I shouted, and the young man heard me not. *A second time* I shouted, and *now* he heard me, for *now* he raised his head'.

'*For this* did Servius give us laws? *For this* did Lucrece bleed?'.

'*For this* was the great vengeance wrought on Tarquin's evil seed?'.

'Amidst the cares of state, the King retained his passion for music, for reading, for writing, for literary society. *To these amusements* he devoted much time'. (Macaulay—*Frederick.*)

'Logan defended the accused governor with great ability in prose. *For lovers of verse*, the speeches of the managers were burlesqued in Simpkin's letters'. No doubt one reason for the position of the phrase in italics is to contrast with the phrase 'in prose' in the preceding sentence.

It is a principle of Order, as regards qualifying circumstances, that, generally speaking, time comes first, place next, and manner last.

In giving Births, Marriages, Deaths, place is usually given first. This is the opening of Carlyle's paper on the Death of Goethe: 'In the Obituary of these days stands one article of quite peculiar import; the *time*, the *place*, and *particulars* of which will have to be often repeated and rewritten and continue in remembrance many centuries: this, namely, that Johann Wolfgang von Goethe died *at Weimar, on the 22nd March*, 1832'.

In obedience to the principle, we should write as follows:—

(Birth). 'On the 7th inst., at 10 Lansdowne Crescent, Mrs. Williamson of a son'.

(Marriage). 'On the 19th, at St. George's, Bloomsbury, by the Rev. Joseph Pickering, Captain Wilson, 19th Regi-

ment, to Maria Ann, second daughter of William Horsman, Esq., of Ashley Grove, Surrey'.

(Death). 'On the 31st prox., at 17 George Street (of apoplexy), James Roger, contractor, aged 69'.

PLACING OF PREPOSITIONS.

The general rule in Prepositions is that they precede their object. One important exception has been adverted to under the Relative Pronouns. When the object is a Relative Pronoun, the preposition is often thrown to the end: 'all *that* he gave me charge *of*'; '*whom* we have to do *with*' (with whom we have to do).

There is another case for inversion, namely, in the Interrogative construction. The emphasis of interrogation requires us to begin a question with 'Who', 'Whom', 'Which', 'What', instead of allowing a preposition to precede: '*What* are we coming to?' not—'*To what* are we coming?' '*Who* or *whom* did you give it to?' not—'*To whom* did you give it?' To preface a question by a preposition, partly does away with the difference between the relative construction and the interrogative.

Speaking of progress, Mr. Disraeli put this interrogation —'Progress, from what to what?'; we might say also, 'progress, what from and what to?', or 'progress, what from and to?'. In the original form, 'and' would possibly be an improvement: 'Progress, from what *and* to what?'

With 'where' as an interrogative word, the preposition always follows: 'where to?' 'wherefore?' This accustoms us to the more emphatic and less ambiguous form. 'From whence' is not so good for interrogation as 'where from?' or 'whence?'

PLACING OF CONJUNCTIONS.

The combinations 'not—but', 'not only—but also', are, properly speaking, Conjunctions. Misplacement is very frequent with them. I give examples. 'I am (*not*) come 'not' to send peace on the earth *but* a sword'. This is a

contraction for—'I am not come to send peace on earth, *I am come* to send a sword'.

'For God sent (*not*) his son into the world 'not' to condemn the world, *but* that the world through him might be saved'.

'It is (*not only*) hard to distinguish 'not only' between too little and too much reform, but between the good and 'the' evil intentions of (different) reformers'.

The following sentence from Swift is very loose and perplexing: 'You are not obliged to take any money which is not gold or silver: *not only* the halfpence or farthings of England, *but* of any other country'. 'You are not obliged to take any money but what is either gold or silver; you need not take any halfpence or farthings, whether of England or of any other country'.

'Aristotle would be, indeed, the sorriest plagiary on record, were the thefts believed of him by his Oxford votaries *not* false *only*, but ridiculous'; 'were *not* the thefts *not only* false, *but also* ridiculous'; 'were the thefts *not both* false *and* ridiculous'; 'not ridiculous as well as false'.

'Psychical states that often recur in a given order *not only* become increasingly coherent *but* the transitions from each to the next become more rapid'. A much deeper derangement. The 'not only' and the 'but' do not correspond: 'not only' is placed before the verb in the first clause, 'but' precedes the entire clause. The harmony is restored thus: '*Not only* do psychical states that often recur in a given order become increasingly coherent, *but also* the transitions from each to the next, became more rapid'.

'Scott's works were the daily food *not only* of his countrymen, *but* of all educated Europe', should be 'of all *the rest of* educated Europe'. Or, 'the daily food not of his countrymen *alone*'. The writer does not mean, though he says, that Scott's countrymen were *not* educated. This involves a breach of propriety rather than of grammar, and is exemplified in such sentences as the following: 'With all his faults about him, he was still perhaps *the greatest* of his contemporaries' (greater than any of his contemporaries);

'he has made the highest number of marks ever made in any former year'—'a higher number of marks than was made in any former year'.

'Whitgift did probably more than *any one* man to establish the Church of England': 'than any *other* man'.

'Northumberland was the most extensive of any Anglo-Saxon state' (Hallam): 'the *most* extensive of *all* the Anglo-Saxon states', or '*more* extensive than any *other* Anglo-Saxon state'.

So: 'We find the Celts furthest to the west of any Aryan people'.

Very common also is the misplacing of the alternative couples: 'neither—nor', 'not—or'.

'Passengers are cautioned *not* to open a carriage door *or* to put their heads out of the windows, when the train is in motion'. The placing of 'not' here commands both infinitives, as is meant. But 'or' is an awkward and unmanageable word; it supposes a preceding 'either', and does not tally well with a previous 'not'. Better to repeat the 'not', or else make it 'neither' and 'nor': '*not* to open a carriage door, *and not* to put their heads'; '*neither* to open, *nor* to put'. Otherwise: 'While the train is in motion, passengers should *neither* open the carriage doors, *nor* put their heads out of the windows'.

PLACING OF ADJUNCTS GENERALLY.

The following examples are meant to draw attention to the position of qualifying words, phrases, and clauses, whether as adjectives or as adverbs. Each qualifying word or set of words should be looked at in its setting; we should try the bearing both before and after.

The common newspaper formula—'The death is announced of—' must be regarded as at best a necessary evil. Somewhat less painful would be—'Announcement is made of the death of'. We are not at liberty to begin with the verb—'announced is the death of', unless with some adverb '*there* is announced the death'; 'just announced, the death'; 'to-

day is announced'. We may, however, adopt another arrangement: 'it is announced that William Brown is dead —died on the 9th at his house in Mayfield Street'.

'In this grate all the heat from back and sides comes into the room instead of being lost in the wall *as usual*'. 'In this grate, all the heat from back and sides, instead of being lost in the wall as usual, comes into the room'.

'*All* free admissions are abolished in this theatre'. This is the use of an adjective before the subject, in place of an adverb before the verb. I conceive the proper form to be—'Free admissions in this theatre are wholly abolished'. The phrase 'in this theatre' exemplifies a very common redundancy; the hanging up of the notice in a particular theatre shows the one that is meant.

'There are four things in a proposition, each of which may be changed into its contrary; subject, predicate, order, and copula'. The arrangement here is such as to sever all the important points from what they should be taken along with. Try this amendment: 'In a proposition there are four things—subject, predicate, order, and copula; and each of these may be changed into its contrary'.

'No doubt this implies powers of discrimination and taste *on the part of the female* which will at first sight appear extremely improbable; but I hope hereafter to shew that this is not the case'. 'No doubt this implies, on the part of the female, powers of discrimination and taste which will appear extremely improbable *at first sight*; but I hope hereafter to show that *such* is not the case'. The phrase 'at first sight' is put at the end, not to be an unnecessary interpolation between the auxiliary and the verb; there being a semicolon break, the reference cannot be carried forward.

I have rarely seen a public notice of any length that would stand to be critically examined. The following intimation in the London omnibuses is unexceptionable: 'To prevent over-charge, please to pay your fare before arriving at your destination, and see the amount duly registered in the way-bill on the door'. It is not at all uncommon in such notices, to put the commencing phrase 'to prevent over-

charge'—at the end; a far inferior arrangement. Another form, not on the whole better, might be—'Before you arrive at your destination [more Saxon—before coming to (the place) where you get out] please to pay your fare, and see the amount duly entered in the way-bill (on the door); thereby preventing over-charge'.

'It may be remarked, that the attaching of importance to declaratory oaths, as a political security, is an indication of minds of a certain stamp, and of a certain amount of intelligence, *which is nearly infallible*'. The greatest misplacement here is the removing of the relative clause so far from its antecedent 'indication'. 'To regard declaratory oaths as an important political security, almost infallibly indicates a particular stamp of mind, and a particular amount of intelligence'.

This is a specimen of good arrangement: '*From the market place of Alsdorf, the little capital of the canton*, the procession makes its way *to the place of meeting at Bözlingen*'. The main action—'the procession makes its way'—has two qualifying adjuncts, both of some length, the one the 'from', the other the 'to'. The writer prefers to make the 'from' precede and the 'to' follow, and the effect justifies his choice. Remark another delicacy of placing in the apposition couples; there was an alternative—'the little capital of the canton, the market-place of Alsdorf'; in favour of which might be pleaded the suspension of the graphic circumstance to the last. The second couple is arranged on this idea; the general phrase, 'place of meeting', precedes the specific name 'Bözlingen'.

'The speech of Lord Strafford, upon his trial, is, in my opinion, one of the most simple, touching, and noble in our language'. (Chatham.) The subject 'speech' is qualified by two adjunct phrases, which must come after; they are both unmistakeably related to the subject, and the second is related to the first by the possessive adjective 'his'. Moreover, 'The speech of Lord Strafford' is better than 'Lord Strafford's speech'; our attention is to be called more particularly to the speech, and therefore it should have the place of prominence. The next point to consider is the placing of

the adverbial adjunct 'in my opinion' between the incomplete verb 'is' and its completion. To make the phrase dangle loosely at the end would be obviously bad. It might, however, come to the beginning, seeing that it sweeps the entire sentence: 'In my opinion, the speech, &c., The objections to this are that too much prominence is given to the person expressing his opinion, while 'the speech' loosesa little of the prominence due to it. If there were serious difference of opinion as to the merits of the speech, the person giving the assertion would be justified in beginning 'In my opinion'; he would then insinuate that others might think differently, and that he spoke only for himself. His using the phrase at all suggests this; but by placing it in the heart of the sentence, he calls the least possible attention to the circumstance that he is merely giving his own opinion. The importance of the speech would probably be enhanced by beginning—'The speech *delivered by* Lord Strafford, on his trial ——'. Our language does not so readily allow the form that would make, 'on his trial' precede 'Lord Strafford'. 'On his trial, Lord Strafford delivered a speech, in my opinion, one of the most simple ——'. We might, as a variety by no means ineffective, turn the sentence thus—'In my opinion, our language does not furnish many speeches more simple, touching, and noble, than the one delivered by Lord Strafford on his trial'—'on his trial by Lord Strafford'. 'There is not to be found in our language a speech, in my opinion, more simple, touching, and noble than Lord Strafford's defence (of himself)'.

'Yours is so laborious a calling, and your competitors are so many and so keen, that not only ambition but amusement tempts many to quit the Inns of Court, and I have known several very able young men drawn aside by a single continental tour during the long vacation'. 'So laborious is your calling, and so many and so keen your competitors, that not ambition merely but amusement tempts many to quit the Inns of Court; to my knowledge, a single continental tour, during the long vacation, has drawn aside several very able young men'.

In Hume's striking eulogy on King Alfred, the disposition of the qualifying adjuncts is generally good, while some slight amendments may be suggested: 'Both living and dead, Alfred was regarded, by foreigners no less than his own subjects, as the greatest prince after Charlemagne who had appeared in Europe during several ages, and as one of the wisest and best who had ever adorned the annals of any nation'. The participial adjuncts to Alfred properly precede, to make way for the adverbial qualifications: 'Both living and dead, Alfred was regarded, by foreigners no less than 'by' his own subjects, as, after Charlemagne, the greatest prince that had appeared in Europe for ages, and as one of the wisest and best that had ever adorned the annals of any nation'.

'The plain of Latium must have been, *in primeval times*, the scene of the grandest conflicts of nature, while the slowly formative agency of water deposited, and the eruptions of mighty volcanoes upheaved, the successive strata of that soil on which the question *was to be decided* to what people the sovereignty of the world *should belong*'. The expressions marked in italics are not in the best places. The phrase 'in primeval times' is imbedded in the first clause, as if confined in its action to that clause. In point of fact, however, it is a general circumstance or situation applicable to the whole sentence. The matters brought forward all relate to what happened in primeval times. In such a case, an adverbial adjunct should not only be placed at the commencement, but should have a comma break to prevent its fusing with the first clause, which would confine it to that clause. The two other expressions could be advantageously transposed: 'was to be decided' separates 'question' from its adjunct 'to what people'. The concluding clause may be made more emphatic by inverting the order of subject and verb, 'to what people should belong the sovereignty of the world'.

The whole might stand thus: 'In primeval times, the plain of Latium must have been the scene of the grandest

conflicts of nature; on the one side, the slowly formative agency of water was depositing, and, on the other side, the eruptive force of mighty volcanoes was upheaving, the successive strata of that soil whereon was to be decided (the question) to what people should belong the sovereignty of the world'.

On the other hand, we may find standing prominently at the head of the sentence an expression that belongs to a subordinate member. '*At first*, it appears that the price of the tickets was not fixed'. We may say—'*At first*, it appears, the price was not fixed': *i.e.*, when the theatre was opened under the special circumstances. Or, retaining the original construction: 'It appears that, *at first*, the price of the tickets was not fixed'.

'When the foundations of the mind of a nation are heaving under the operation of truths which it is now for the first time making its own, more important changes will follow in fifty years than in two centuries of calmer, or more stagnant existence'.

Let us examine the qualifications minutely; taking first the words and phrases.

'The foundations of the mind of a nation'. The first of these nouns is the subject of the preliminary adverbial clause, the others enter into phrases qualifying it. The phrase 'of the mind' qualifies 'foundations', while 'mind' is itself qualified by 'of the nation'. The only place of these adjective phrases (as they must be called in ordinary parsing) is after the noun. When possessives can be substituted, the position is before the noun—'a mind's foundations', 'a nation's mind'—which is a considerable gain to the general effect of the sentence; the subject comes at once into contact with its verb, and stands out with greater prominence. 'Are heaving under the operation of new truths which it is now for the first time making its own'. The verb 'are heaving' is here coupled with a very long qualification, involving numerous smaller qualifying adjuncts. The leading phrase is 'under the operation', which immediately

follows the verb (intransitive). 'Operation' is qualified by the phrase 'of new truths'; 'truths', already qualified by 'new', is farther acted on by the adjective or restrictive clause—'which it is now—'. That clause contains a transitive (incomplete) verb and object, and two adverb qualifications, placed between the auxiliary and the participle—'now', 'for the first time'. The subject is the demonstrative 'it', whose reference is to the second of the three nouns in the complex subject of 'are heaving'; a somewhat awkward reference, since nothing but a consideration of the meaning could lead us to decide between 'mind' and 'nation' as the antecedent; while, but for the plural number, we should have gone by preference to 'foundations', the real subject of the clause.

Every one of the adjuncts is placed according to the rules suited to the circumstances. The only question arising is whether we could not reduce and simplify the excessive load of qualifications; at the same time amending the reference of the demonstrative 'it'. For 'the foundations of the mind of a nation are heaving' say, simply 'when a nation's mind is heaving'. For the long qualification to 'heaving', say 'under the working of truths for the first time made its own'; or 'heaving under truths newly made its own'.

'More important changes will follow in fifty years than in two centuries of calmer and more stagnant existence'. The main subject 'changes' has two adjuncts, 'more' and 'important'. The usual operation of two adjectives is to narrow the noun by both limitations; a 'clever young man' means that we are first to select from the class 'men', those that are young; and next to select from this narrowed class a still narrower class 'clever'. If the present example had been 'great important changes', there would have been a double selection in this way. But the word 'more' is both adjective and adverb; it expresses not quality but quantity, which gives a different turn to the rendering of an adjective. By the rule of priority, a qualifying word placed before affects not simply the next word but everything up to a break; that is, it affects not 'important' alone but 'impor-

tant changes'; and the meaning is—*a greater number of* important changes. Often, however, such a word is intended by the speaker to affect the following word solely: 'more', being also an adverb, may qualify 'important'; the meaning then is—changes of *greater* importance. If the first meaning is intended, the phrase might stand, as being justified by the law of priority. If the second meaning is intended, the above alteration should be made.

'Changes will follow' is somewhat redundant; 'change' implies succession, and is expressive enough without 'follow'; 'will be made' is enough; or simply 'there will be more changes of importance'.

'Will follow in fifty years'. The phrase of time, placed close after 'follow', might precede, thus: 'there will, in fifty years, be more changes of importance'. 'Than in two centuries of calmer or more stagnant existence'. The 'than' refers to the 'more changes'; and it is an improvement to bring the expressions closer together, as in the alteration last suggested. In contrasting 'fifty *years*' and 'two *centuries*', the varying of the unit is of doubtful advantage: 'a half century' and 'two whole centuries', 'fifty years' and 'two hundred'. After an emphatic comparison, we should avoid other uses of the comparative degree—'two centuries of *calm* or *stagnant* existence'.

To give the sentence entire:—'While a nation's mind heaves under the working of truths newly made its own, in fifty years there will be (more changes of importance) a greater number of important changes than in two hundred years of stagnant existence'. The sentence as given is a good example of the employment of the progressive tense—'are heaving', 'is now making'. Nevertheless, I have changed the progressive to the indefinite, for no stronger reason than to avoid the alliteration of 'heaving', 'working'; the fact being, that the conjunction 'when', coupled with 'heaves', sufficiently answers the purpose; and by using 'while' with the indefinite, we should get the full sense of the progressive. Precision in stating time depends far more on the adverbial and other adjuncts than on the tenses.

'Mr. Disraeli, treating Hellenic things with the scornful negligence natural to a Hebrew, said the other day in a well-known book that our aristocratic class, the polite flower of the nation, were truly Hellenic in this respect among others —that they cared nothing for letters and never read. Now, there seems to be here some inaccuracy, if we take our standard of what is Hellenic from Hellas at its highest pitch of development; for the latest historian of Greece, Dr. Curtius, tells us that in the Athens of Pericles 'reading was universally diffused'; and again, that 'what more than anything' distinguishes the Greeks from the barbarians of ancient and modern times, is the idea of a culture comprehending body *and soul* in an equal measure. And we have ourselves called our aristocratic class *barbarians*, which is the contrary of Hellenes, from this very reason; because, with all their fine, fresh appearance, their open-air life, and their love for field-sports, for reading and thinking they have in general no turn'.

'Mr. Disraeli, treating Hellenic things with the scornful negligence natural to a Hebrew'. 'Mr. Disraeli' is the principal subject qualified by the clause 'treating, &c.' This qualifying clause is well placed, being in closest proximity to the noun qualified. 'Treating' has for its object 'things' and is qualified by the adverbial phrase (for such it is) 'with the scornful negligence natural to a Hebrew'. This phrase occupies its right position immediately after the object of the verb. 'Negligence' is qualified by 'scornful' and by 'natural to a Hebrew'. The second of these follows the noun, because it is an adjective with enlargement; were it a bare adjective it would come before the noun. It is always objectionable to have a long clause intervening between subject and verb (as here), and so this clause might be shortened. Say, 'treating Hellenic things with the scornful negligence of a Hebrew' (better than 'with a Hebrew's scornful negligence'); where 'natural to' finds its substitute in the preposition 'of'. Sometimes in cases like the present it is possible to substitute a simple adjective for adjective and enlargement, and then we gain in brevity.

Here, however, this cannot be done without changing the meaning: 'with scornful Hebrew negligence' is a different thing from 'with the scornful negligence of a Hebrew'.

'Said the other day in a well-known book that our aristocratic class, the polite flower of the nation, were truly Hellenic in this respect among others,—that they cared nothing for letters and never read'.

We now get the predicate verb 'said' with its qualifications. The adverbial qualifications are two in number—'the other day', 'in a well-known book'. Standing where they do, they come in awkwardly, inasmuch as they keep the verb 'said' too far away from its noun clause 'that, &c.'; but to place them anywhere else—retaining the Past Indefinite tense of the verb—would be very objectionable. Amend in either of the following ways: 'Mr. Disraeli, treating Hellenic things with the scornful negligence of a Hebrew, has lately said that our aristocratic class &c.' (where the tense of the verb is changed from the past indefinite into the present perfect, and where 'the other day' finds its equivalent in 'lately', and 'in a well-known book' is omitted); or 'Mr. Disraeli, treating &c., said lately in a well-known book' (where both adjuncts are retained, the first being shortened into 'lately').

'The polite flower of the nation' is in apposition to 'aristocratic class', and finds its proper place immediately after 'class'. The second qualification of 'flower' might be shortened (though not well) by using the possessive; thus, 'the nation's polite flower'. It would be poetical to say 'the nation's flower polite'.

The placing of the adverbial phrase 'in this respect among others' is observable. Standing thus, the phrase comes into exact contiguity with its own development—'that they cared &c.'. 'Cared' is qualified by 'nothing', which is best placed between 'cared' and 'for', but which might be changed into 'not' or 'not anything'.

'Now, there seems to be here some inaccuracy, if we take our standard of what is Hellenic from Hellas at its highest pitch of development'. 'Now' indicates a criticism, and is

well placed at the commencement. Clauses 1 and 2 should be transposed, that thus the assertion 'there seems to be here some inaccuracy', may come into juxtaposition with the reason, 'for &c'. The principal subject in this clause is 'inaccuracy', which follows its verb, because the verb is preceded by the adverb 'there'. 'Here' is wrongly placed. It should stand at the beginning or be thrown to the conclusion of the clause: 'Now, here there seems &c', or 'now there seems to be seems to be some inaccuracy here'. In the subordinate adverbial clause, 'if we take our standard &c.', the adjuncts are well placed; but owing to the long adjunct of 'standard', there is too large a gap between 'take' and 'from'. This might in some measure be avoided if we were to shorten thus—'our standard of the Hellenic'.

'For the latest historian of Greece, Dr. Curtius, tells us that in the Athens of Pericles 'reading was universally diffused''. 'Historian' is here the principal subject, which has two qualifications, 'latest' and 'of Greece'. 'Of Greece' might be changed into the adjective 'Greek' (though not without producing a slight ambiguity of meaning), and then 'historian' would be brought close to its noun in apposition, 'Dr. Curtius': 'the latest Greek historian, Dr. Curtius'. In the noun clause, 'that in the Athens of Pericles &c', the verb is restricted doubly—first, by 'in the Athens of Pericles', then by the adverb 'universally'. The placing of these adjuncts is good. 'Universally' comes between the auxiliary and the participle, and 'in the Athens of Pericles' is placed before the quotation, that thus the restriction implied in it may be seen to belong to the writer and not to Dr. Curtius.

'And again, that 'what more than anything' distinguishes the Greeks from the barbarians of ancient and modern times, is the idea of a culture comprehending body *and soul* in an equal measure'.

This is a continuation of the noun clause attached to 'tells', and so is introduced by 'that' and by the adverb 'again'. The qualification 'more than anything' precedes the verb, on the principle that qualifying words should be placed as near as possible to the words they qualify. 'More'

and 'than' are in juxtaposition. 'Barbarians' is qualified by the adjective phrase 'of ancient and modern times', and has this phrase properly placed after it. But for the sake of brevity it would be better to use the simple adjective here and to say 'ancient and modern barbarians'. 'Idea' is qualified by the phrase 'of a culture &c.', and requires that this phrase should come after it. 'Culture' itself is qualified by 'comprehending', and the appendages of 'comprehending' (a transitive verb) are placed in strict accordance with the rule; 'body and soul' (the object) following it immediately, and 'in an equal measure' (the adverbial adjunct) coming last.

'And we have ourselves called our aristocratic class *barbarians*, which is the contrary of Hellenes, from this very reason'.

The subject here is 'we', intensified by the reflective pronoun 'ourselves'. It requires that this pronoun shall be in immediate contact with it; and so 'we have ourselves called' is not the proper order, but 'we ourselves have called'. In the present instance, 'we' had better be turned into the singular 'I'; it refers to the individual writer, and is followed immediately by 'our', which is intended to have a wider reference. 'Barbarians' is followed by the defining clause 'which is the contrary of Hellenes', and has this clause in contiguity with it. As, however, the clause is a defining one, it should be made as short as possible, and so "which is' should be omitted, thus—'barbarians, the contrary of Hellenes'. 'From this very reason' is put to the end in order to be near 'because'.

'Because, with all their fine, fresh appearance, their open-air life, and their love for field-sports, for reading and thinking they have in general no turn'.

'They' is the main subject, whose qualifying adjuncts are —'with all their fine fresh appearance', 'their open-air life', and 'their love for field-sports'. These adjuncts are well placed before the subject; but as they indicate three distinct things, the preposition 'with' should be repeated before each of them. They may also be regarded as condensed adverbial

(concessive) clauses, modifying the predicate. 'For reading and thinking' is connected with 'turn', and should be placed near it. Standing as it here does, it shuts out the subject from its qualifications, and looks as though itself had been intended to be joined with 'love', and not with 'turn'. 'No' might be 'not any'. 'In general' is rightly placed; any other position would not give the meaning intended.

'The declaimer, who can electrify a crowd by passionate appeals, or splendid images, which give no clear perceptions to the intellect, which develope no general truth, which breathe no firm, disinterested purpose, passes for a great man. How few reflect, that the greater man is he, who, without noise or show, is wisely fixing in a few minds broad, pregnant, generous principles of judgment and action, and giving an impulse which will carry them on for ever. Jesus, with that divine wisdom which separates him from all other teachers, declared that the first requisite for becoming 'great in his kingdom', which was another phrase for 'exerting a great moral influence, was Humility; by which he meant a spirit opposed to that passion for conspicuous station with which he saw his disciples inflamed, a spirit of deep unpretending philanthropy, manifested in sympathy with the wants of the mind, and in condescension to any efforts by which the ignorant and tempted might be brought to truth and virtue. According to these views, we think it a greater work to educate a child in the true and large sense of that phrase, than to rule a state'.

'Declaimer' is the main subject, and is qualified by the long relative clause introduced by 'who'. This clause follows the subject and is placed close to it. 'Who' is manifestly co-ordinating. The qualifying adjunct of 'can electrify' is 'by passionate appeals', which is separated from the verb by the verb's object ('a crowd'), on the principle that when the verb has an object the adverb usually follows the object. If, however, we regard 'can' as an auxiliary, the proper position of the adverbial phrase would be after the auxiliary: thus, 'can by passionate appeals electrify'.

'Or' gives the alternative, and so the preposition 'by' should be repeated before 'splendid'. The succeeding clauses introduced by 'which' are clauses restrictive of 'images' solely. In that case, 'images' ought to be repeated, and 'which' should be changed into 'that': 'images that give no clear perceptions &c.'. 'No' is 'not any', and by using this last form here the doubly restrictive force of the two adjectives 'any' and 'clear' would be shewn with prominence. 'Perceptions' is the object of 'give', and so follows it, while 'to the intellect' necessarily comes last.

'How few reflect, that the greater man is he, who, without noise or show, is wisely fixing in a few minds broad, pregnant, generous principles of judgment and action, and giving an impulse which will carry them on for ever'.

The real subject here is 'men' or 'persons' understood; a subject limited by the adjective 'few', which in its turn is limited by the adverb 'how'. 'How' has much the same force as 'very', only it is stronger and more emphatic. The noun clause introduced by 'that' is the object of the verb, and so follows it. In this noun clause there is a beautiful inversion of the subject and the verb, in the phrase 'the greater man is he'. By means of this inversion emphasis is obtained, and 'he' (the subject) is brought into closest contact with 'who &c.' (its qualifying clause). 'Who' is restrictive and should be changed into 'that'. 'Is fixing' is the predicate of the subordinate clause—the present progressive of a transitive verb. The placing of the adjuncts of this verb is specially observable. These adjuncts are three in number—'without noise or show', 'wisely', 'in a few minds'. Now it is a rule that when the verb is made up of an auxiliary and a participle, the adverb is placed between the two. But, manifestly, to place all the three adverbial adjuncts between the auxiliary and the participle would be intolerable. A distribution of adjuncts then must be made; and the distribution here given seems to be the best possible. 'Without noise or show' comes first. Then follows 'wisely', which, as being the shortest of the three, is placed *within* the verb. Last of all comes 'in a few

minds', which is placed after the verb. 'In a few minds' might be thrown to the end of the clause, but not well. Such a position would allow the object to be brought into closer proximity with the verb, but then it would have the disadvantage of removing one of the adverbial adjuncts to a great distance from the other two, and hence the removal would be objectionable. 'Principles' is the object of the verb 'is fixing', and is qualified by the three adjectives 'broad', 'pregnant', 'generous', and by the double adjective phrase 'of judgment and action'. The three adjectives precede the noun, and their effect is to produce a threefold narrowing of its meaning. The adjective phrase follows it, and the effect is to narrow the meaning still further. 'And giving an impulse, &c'. 'Is' should be repeated before 'giving'; this is all the more necessary because 'wisely' is inserted between the previous 'is' and its participle, and 'wisely' has not to be repeated here. 'Them' refers to 'minds', and so it would be better to repeat 'minds' and say, 'will carry those minds on for ever'. 'For ever' is well placed at the conclusion. In this position it follows the object, and is brought into proximity with 'on', of which it is a prolongation.

'Jesus, with that divine wisdom which separates him from all other teachers, declared that the first requisite for becoming 'great in his kingdom', which was another phrase for exerting a great moral influence, was Humility'.

The main subject of the clause is 'Jesus', and the predicate 'declared', and between the two is placed the clause that limits the subject, viz., 'with that divine wisdom, &c.' The object of the verb is the noun clause 'that &c.' In this noun clause, 'requisite' is qualified by the adjective 'first', and by the adjective phrase 'for becoming, &c.' The position of these adjuncts is unexceptionable; but the second adjunct might be shortened; instead of 'for becoming great in his kingdom', we might say 'of greatness in his kingdom'. The parenthetical clause, 'which was &c.', occupies its right place; but the clause itself is long and clumsy, and the opening word 'which' is bad, inasmuch as

it may be taken to refer to 'requisite', whereas it refers really to 'becoming great, &c.' Amend by striking out the words 'which was another phrase', and by substituting the words 'that is': 'the first requisite for becoming great in his kingdom, that is, for exerting a great moral influence'. The meaning of 'influence' is limited first by 'moral', then by 'great'. The influence to be exerted is to be a '*moral*' influence, yea, more, it is to be a '*great* moral' influence.

'By which he meant a spirit opposed to that passion for conspicuous station with which he saw his disciples inflamed, a spirit of deep, unpretending philanthropy, manifested in sympathy with the wants of the mind, and in condescension to any efforts by which the ignorant and tempted might be brought to truth and virtue'.

'By which' is bad here. It refers simply to 'Humility', not to the clause wherein Humility occurs; and at best, 'which' used in this manner at the commencement of the sentence, gives but a weak form of reference. It would be better to repeat 'Humility', and to say 'and by Humility he meant, &c.' 'Spirit' is the object of the verb 'meant', and the adjuncts of 'spirit' are 'opposed to that passion, &c.', and 'of deep unpretending philanthropy, &c.' Let us note the placing of these adjuncts. The first of them, had it been a simple adjective, would have found its place immediately before the noun it qualifies; as, however, it is not a simple adjective, but an adjective with enlargement, it is placed after the noun. The second is joined to the first, but only mediately—through the repetition of the substantive 'spirit'. This exemplifies a rule that the repetition of the substantive is required when the adjuncts of a noun are partly adjectives with their enlargements and partly adjective phrases.

In the enlargement of the first adjunct, 'passion' is coupled with a long qualification, 'for conspicuous station, &c.' 'Which' in this qualification is of ambiguous reference. There is not anything either in its own position, or in the structure of the sentence, that can tell us whether it refers to 'passion' or to 'station', or to 'passion for con-

spicuous station'. The reference must be determined *ab extra*. All ambiguity would be cleared away, if we could shorten the clause, 'with which he saw his disciples inflamed', and change its place. Perhaps the following comes as near the meaning as any: 'By which he meant a spirit opposed to his disciples' passion for conspicuous station'. It seems impossible to change the adjective phrase 'for conspicuous station'.

In the second group of adjuncts belonging to 'spirit', 'philanthropy' is qualified by the two adjectives 'deep' and 'unpretending', and by the adjective phrase 'manifested in sympathy with, &c.' The reference in 'manifested &c.' might be either to 'spirit' or to 'philanthropy'. In strict grammar it is to 'spirit', for 'philanthropy' is part of the adjective phrase attached to 'spirit'; but the writer intends that it shall be to 'philanthropy'. The ambiguity could be got rid of by repeating 'philanthropy'; 'spirit of deep unpretending philanthropy—philanthropy manifested &c.' The adjuncts of 'manifested' are too long. They might be shortened, thus: 'in sympathy with the mind's wants and in condescension to any efforts for bringing the ignorant and the tempted to truth and to virtue'. As '*the ignorant*' and '*the tempted*' constitute two distinct classes, the article should be repeated before each; and as '*truth*' and '*virtue*' are not the same thing, the repetition of 'to' is required before the second. Observe that 'truth' is parallel to 'the ignorant', and 'virtue' to 'the tempted'.

'According to these views, we think it a greater work to educate a child, in the true and large sense of that phrase, than to rule a state'.

The adverbial clause 'according to these views' is well placed at the beginning. Standing in this position, it points back to what has gone before, and affects the whole of the sentence that follows. The use of 'it' is very objectionable. Better to alter the sentence, and say 'we think the educating of a child in the true and large sense of that phrase, a greater work than the ruling of a state'. By this alteration we get rid of an inelegance, we make sure that the paren-

thetical clause shall refer to its own phrase solely, and we bring 'greater' and 'than' into juxtaposition.

In the parenthesis, the article is not repeated before 'large', because 'true' and 'large' go to define the one sense intended. The effect of repeating the article would be to divide the one sense into two distinct senses, a '*true* sense' on the one hand, and a '*large* sense' on the other.

'In bloodless war of controversy for a vital cause, where the appeal is on a few broad questions to national opinion, there may be like need to beat roughly down opposing arguments, to roll in the dust and march over the credit of opposing reasoners, without staying a blow to an opponent's credit as a reasoner from just consideration of his feelings and impartial weighing of his merits'.

'In bloodless war of controversy for a vital cause'. This adverbial phrase is well placed at the commencement. In this position it affects the whole of what follows. 'War' is qualified by 'bloodless' (an adjective), and by 'of controversy for a vital cause' (an adjective phrase). The adjective phrase transgresses the law of brevity and should be shortened. The best way of shortening it would be to resolve the adjunct of 'controversy' into an adjective. Say 'bloodless war of *important* (or *legitimate* or *justifiable*) controversy'. 'Where the appeal, &c.' is an adverbial clause referring to the preceding, and rightly stands in close connection with it. The placing of adjuncts in this clause is exceptionable. It is wrong to separate the predicate from its complement by such a phrase as 'on a few broad questions'. This phrase is intended to limit 'appeal', and so should be placed beside it. The best arrangement would be, 'where on a few broad questions the appeal is to national opinion'.

'There may be like need to beat roughly down opposing arguments'. The inversion here is secured through the use of 'there'. By means of this inversion the subject 'need' is brought into juxtaposition with its complement, 'to beat down &c.'. The adverb 'roughly' occupies the wrong place.

Standing where it does, it qualifies 'down', whereas it manifestly ought to qualify 'beat'. It is not the 'downness' that is 'rough', but the 'beating'. Say then: 'to beat down opposing arguments roughly'.

'To roll in the dust and march over the credit of opposing reasoners'. 'In the dust' is placed awkwardly. It should follow the object of the verb. Try then: 'To roll the credit of opposing reasoners in the dust and to march over it'.

'Without staying a blow to an opponent's credit as a reasoner from just consideration of his feelings and impartial weighing of his merits'. This adverbial phrase is well placed at the end; but the placing of the parts of the phrase itself is not good. First, 'as a reasoner' refers to 'opponent', and so ought to be brought into contact with it: thus, 'to the credit of an opponent as a reasoner'. (This is a case where the use of an adjective phrase is decidedly better than the use of a possessive). Then, 'from just consideration, &c.' is too far removed from 'staying'; although we could not possibly bring it nearer without changing the entire sentence. Lastly, *if* 'consideration of his feelings' and 'weighing of his merits' are to be taken as two different things, the preposition should be used before each of them.

'But now ye seek to kill *me*, a man that hath told you the *truth* which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham'.

Observe here the perfect placing of the clauses, 'a man &c.' and 'which I have heard &c.'; also, the inversion in 'this did not Abraham'.

I will next, as a specimen of Parsing for Order, examine the consecutive sentences of an interesting and well-written paragraph from Sharp's Essays. It is the commencement of the Essay on English Style.

'During the last thirty or forty years, English Literature has been enriched with many valuable compositions in prose and in verse'. The adverbial phrase, 'During the last thirty

or forty years', qualifies the whole sentence, and both on that ground, and as being an adjunct of Time, is suitably placed at the commencement. If necessary, it could be given as a parenthetic clause after 'English Literature'; the advantage of the arrangement being to allow the utmost degree of prominence to the subject. Not on any account, however, could the phrase be put farther on; least of all, could it be thrown, as might be done in loose writing, to the end of the sentence.

The arrangement of the other parts of the sentence is as good as any that could be suggested. The adverbial phrases, 'with many valuable compositions', 'in prose and in verse', must come after the verb 'enriched', and the second must follow the first, as qualifying the word 'compositions'. We may study the effect of changing the present order by converting the passive into an active construction: 'many valuable compositions in prose and in verse have enriched English Literature'. This has the gain of throwing the most important subject into the place of emphasis at the end. As a piquant variety, to be rarely indulged in, we might also say—'compositions, many and valuable, in prose and in verse, have, during the last thirty or forty years, enriched English Literature'.

There are no adjectives equivalent to 'in prose and in verse'; hence we cannot place all the qualifications of 'composition' before the noun. 'Prosaic' does not give the sense of 'in prose', and 'metrical' would be somewhat affected. The nearest approach to the arrangement sought would be —'many valuable prose and verse compositions'; which we try only to decline as inferior to the original form.

'Many wise and learned men have made use of our language in communicating their sentiments concerning all the important branches of science and art'. A simple transitive sentence with phrase adjuncts. In studying the niceties of the arrangement, we remark that 'of our language' stands between 'use' and 'in communicating'; the interruption is immaterial, but yet might be remedied: 'have adopted our language as a vehicle for communicating ——'. In every

other instance, the qualifying words are close to the words qualified; the adjectives coming before, and the phrases after.

To exhibit the variations of order, we must recast the sentence and judge of the results. First change:—'Our language has been made use of by many wise and learned men to communicate their sentiments'. One effect of this variation is to bring to the position of emphasis at the beginning 'our language', which is the subject uppermost in the essay; a change for the better. Another effect is to make closer the connection between 'many wise and learned men' and the verb 'to communicate'. It is true that 'our language' is also included in the statement of the action performed by the men, but this is still in immediate connection, being placed before; so that the qualifying circumstances are, on the whole, made closer to the subject. Second change:—'Many wise and learned men, in communicating their sentiments concerning all the important branches of science and art, have made use of our language'. Here we have, as before, a close connection between 'men' and 'communicating', but 'our language' is thrown to the end; an arrangement that has something to recommend it. The sentence becomes a period. The important designation 'our language' is rendered emphatic by closing the sentence. Neither this change nor the first is inferior to the author's own form. Third change:—'All the important branches of science and art have been expounded in our language by many wise and learned men'; 'have been expounded by many wise and learned men through the medium of our language'. Both these varieties are admissible, but inferior to the others. The qualifications are not brought so close. Moreover, 'all the important branches of science and art' is less suitable for the beginning, than for the middle or the end of the sentence; it is not the author's purpose to bring what might be a leading topic into special prominence.

The only other remark to be made on the sentence is one bearing on the law of forward qualification. The three ad-

jectives that precede 'men' are to be construed thus. 'Men' is qualified by 'wise', making a select class 'wise men'; 'learned' gives another selection 'learned men'. The two select classes are conjoined into a sum by the conjunction. The numeral adjective 'many' qualifies the sum or couple as a whole; it is not confined to its immediate sequence 'wise', but sweeps the whole phrase 'wise and learned men'; the meaning at full is 'many wise men and many learned men'; not 'many wise men and' an unspecified number of 'learned men' To restrict the 'many' to 'wise', we should need to join a distinct and neutralizing epithet with 'learned': 'many wise and a few learned men'.

The conjunction between 'wise' and 'learned' has properly the effect of constituting, as above stated, two classes. If both adjectives are to apply to one class, there ought not to be a conjunction; it should be 'wise learned men'; so 'great good men', 'tall young men', 'beautiful moss rose', 'fertile sloping banks'. Yet we not unfrequently find the conjunction in use for this meaning; and we cannot be quite sure that 'wise and learned men' is not intended first to distinguish, then to add together, the two classes. The combination 'wise learned men' is stiff; and the more elegant and usual form would be to throw the adjectives after the verb; 'men wise and learned' would be held by preference to intimate that the same men are both wise and learned. 'Many men, wise and learned' would certainly imply that there is but one class, a class narrowed by the double selection.

'All kinds of subjects have been skilfully treated in it, and many works of taste and genius have been written with great and well-deserved success'. Let us take this member by itself in the first instance. For 'All kinds of subjects' we might have 'Subjects of every kind', which would place the main word at the beginning. The position of the first adverb 'skilfully' is between the parts of the verb; an arrangement suited to the case, although the writer could have said without inconvenience, 'treated in it skilfully', seeing that the adverb could not be referred to what follows

it. Another order of the clause is—'In it subjects of every kind have been treated skilfully'; this would bring the pronoun close to the antecedent 'English Language' in the previous sentence. We might also have an effective inversion—'In it have been treated skilfully the most various subjects': or the same effect with the regular grammatical order: 'It has been used in the skilful treatment of every variety of subjects'.

Study now the second clause—'and many works of taste and genius have been written with great and well-deserved success'. The carrying of 'in it' to the beginning suits this clause also. In respect of order, the clause is well enough as it stands; but as an exercise, we may give other arrangements. For one thing, we might put the adverbial adjunct in harmony with the single-word adverb in the previous clause: 'and many works of taste and genius have been successfully written ('composed' would sound better)'. We could also have retained the author's more emphatic phrase, converting 'skilfully' into a similar phrase, and so attaining conformity of structure. Another arrangement —'there have been successfully composed many works of genius and taste'; this would suit the form of the previous clause ending with 'subjects'. Otherwise still: 'the works of taste and genius composed in it have been greatly and deservedly successful'; this would bring out perhaps yet better the author's intended laudation of the works. We could do without 'many'; trusting to the intensity of the predicate for the desired impression.

When we look to the phrase in the second clause, 'works of taste and genius', we see that the author contrasts these with 'subjects' in the first clause; but the contrast is not apparent. 'Subject' is vague; we can just divine that the reference is to the expository works of the language; while the second clause alludes to the poetry.

Let us now quote the other member of the sentence:—'Yet perhaps it will appear, upon a careful view of these compositions, that, whatever credit their authors are entitled to, for acuteness of understanding, strength of

imagination, delicacy of taste, or energy of passion, there are but few of them that deserve the praise of having expressed themselves in a pure and genuine strain of English.' The arrangement is on the whole good, and the sentence is a period. There is an alternative placing of the first adverbial phrase, thus: 'yet perhaps, upon a careful view of these compositions, it will *appear that*'; the verb 'appear' is now in contact with its apposition subject clause; and there is the gain of putting in advance a qualification of wide sweep. Otherwise—'Yet perhaps a careful view of these compositions will show that—'; besides the advantage of shortness, we get rid of a confusing 'it'. Farther on, we may re-adjust so as to make still closer some of the qualifying and qualified words: 'appear that, however much their authors are entitled to *credit for* acuteness of understanding, &c.' The concluding clause—'there are but few of them that deserve the praise', may be shortened: 'few of them deserve the praise of *having expressed* (past tense unnecessary, 'expressing') themselves in a pure and genuine strain of English'. As a variety—'few of them can be commended for expressing themselves in English of a pure and genuine strain—in a strain of English, pure and genuine'.

'In general they have preferred such a choice, and arrangement of words, as an early acquaintance with some other language, and the neglected study of their own would incline them to'.

Remark first the daring relative construction with the preposition, thrown to the end of the sentence; the restrictive 'such as' is happily chosen. As to the order, the writer commences with one of the adverbial phrases that usually and properly begin the sentence. We could say—'They have *in general* preferred'; and little harm would be done, seeing that there are no other qualifications to block up the verb, and call for some relief. The placing of the clauses is unexceptionable. To show the capabilities of the case, we may indicate one or two varieties:—'Generally their choice and their arrangement of words are such as they would be inclined to by an early acquaintance with some

other language, and the neglected study of their own'. 'In general they choose and arrange their words in such a way (their way of choosing and arranging their words is such) as to prove that they have been early taught some other language, and have neglected their own'. In the form 'they have preferred', there is again an unnecessary departure from the universal tense—'they prefer'.

'Sometimes also we find them expressing a mean opinion of their native tongue'. If the two prefixed adverbs were attached to the verb, the order would be—'We find them *also sometimes* expressing—'; the 'also' may be considered the prior qualification. It might be—'Also (moreover), we *sometimes* find them expressing—'. Or, 'we find them expressing themselves meanly of their native (own) tongue' To suit the ending of the previous sentence, we might invert thus: 'Of their own tongue they sometimes express a mean opinion—show that they think meanly'.

'This, however, I am the less inclined to wonder at, as I am convinced that those only can speak of our language without respect who are ignorant of its nature and qualities'. Less happy, perhaps, than any of the foregoing sentences. The placing of the demonstrative 'this' at the commencement is a needless inversion; we could easily follow the reference in the routine order of grammar—'I am the less inclined to wonder at *this*—'. The next clause is perplexed with an 'only': '(as I am) 'being' convinced that those *only* can speak—'. The 'only' should qualify 'those', and therefore precede it; but then the qualifying stress might not be confined to the demonstrative, but might command the whole clause—'those can speak of our language without respect'. One remedy is to use '*alone*': '*those alone* can speak—'. Another remedy is to isolate 'those' by throwing it to the end of the clause: 'being convinced that our language can be spoken of without respect *only* by *(those who)* 'such as' are ignorant of its nature and qualities'. Another but not better variety: 'only through ignorance of the nature and qualities (powers, capabilities) of our language

can it be spoken of without respect'—'can any one speak of our language without respect'.

'Perhaps it is as capable of receiving any impression that a man of taste and genius may choose to stamp upon it, and is as easily moulded into all the various forms of passion, elegance, and sublimity, as 'is' any language, ancient or modern'. The 'Perhaps' need not in this instance be the first word: 'It is *perhaps* as capable—'. We may retain the commencing place for the main subject, although expressed by the neuter pronoun. There would be dignity in repeating the word: 'The language is as capable', 'It is a language as capable—'. The remainder of the sentence runs on with a flowing arrangement presenting nothing special to remark upon; it is altogether a well managed period. We may as an exercise invert the order thus: 'Perhaps there is not any language, ancient or modern, more capable of receiving whatever impressions a man of taste and genius may desire to produce, or more easily moulded into all the various forms of passion, elegance, and sublimity'.

'Some men of eminence in letters, (having seen) 'seeing' how well the fashionable world has succeeded in imitating the manners of the French, have endeavoured to raise themselves into reputation by importing their forms of speech, and, not contented with the good old English idiom, have dressed out their works with all the tawdriness of French phraseology'. Varied thus: 'Some eminent literary men, seeing how well the world of fashion has succeeded in imitating French manners, have sought reputation by importing French forms of speech; not contented with good old English idiom, they have dressed out their works in French tawdriness'.

'But this injudicious fashion [say 'practice': 'fashion' just used in a different sense] of adulterating our language with foreign mixtures, is more especially the case with respect to the Latin, to the laws of which, many of our writers, and indeed some also of our grammarians, have so strenuously endeavoured to subject our language, that

Brown's prophecy, in the preface to his 'Vulgar Errors' is at length come to pass, and we are forced to study Latin in order to understand English'. Notwithstanding the length, the qualifications are well placed. The wordiness might be somewhat reduced; and the parts might be redistributed. A more emphatic position could be given to 'Latin', which is the main theme of the sentence. 'But it is the Latin that is the more especial source of foreign adulterations; many writers, and indeed some grammarians also, have so strenuously aimed at subjecting our language to Latin rules, that the prophecy of Brown, in his preface to "Vulgar Errors", is at length come to pass,——'. To aid the author's emphasis, the second member may commence with an inversion: 'so strenuously have many writers, and indeed some grammarians also, aimed at subjecting—'.

'As I do not notice these alterations in our language in order to commend them, I shall not produce any particular instances'. The 'not' is scarcely where it ought to be. It qualifies too much; the negation is meant for the phrase 'in order to commend them': 'As my noticing these alterations is *not* with the view of commending them, I refrain from quoting instances'. An excess of 'nots' should be avoided; the last clause as it stands, however, is better than 'I shall produce *no* particular instances', a form that we are always too prone to run into.

I conclude with an exercise attended with greater difficulties. I quote the passage at full.

'According to the Greatest Happiness Principle, as above explained, the ultimate end, with reference to and for the sake of which all other things are desirable (whether we are considering our own good or that of other people), is an existence exempt as far as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments, both in point of quantity and quality; the test of quality, and the rule for measuring it against quantity, being the preference felt by those who in their opportunities of experience, to which must be added their habits of self-consciousness and self-observation,

are best furnished with the means of comparison. This, being, according to the utilitarian opinion, the end of human action, is necessarily also the standard of morality: which may accordingly be defined, the rules and precepts for human conduct, by the observance of which an existence such as has been described might be, to the greatest extent possible, secured to all mankind; and not to them only, but so far as the nature of things admits, to the whole sentient creation'.

'According to the Greatest Happiness Principle, as above explained'. This adverbial phrase sweeps the entire sentence, and is accordingly placed first, and detached by a comma from the first clause. 'Greatest Happiness Principle' is a condensed expression made up of a noun (with an adjective) qualifying another noun. This is a case where the first adjective is limited to the noun immediately following; we could not make 'Greatest' qualify the compound 'Happiness Principle'. The participial phrase 'as above explained' farther qualifies 'Greatest Happiness Principle' by introducing a reference to what went before. In so long a sentence, all such expressions should be short; and perhaps the adverb 'then' would have been enough.

'The ultimate end, with reference to and for the sake of which all other things (ends) are desirable'. The main subject is now stated—'end', qualified first by the adjective 'ultimate', and next by the contracted compound relative clause, whose place is after the noun. The 'which' might be repeated—'with reference to *which*, and for the sake of which, all other things are desirable'.

It is allowable to have an adjective before a noun and an adjective clause after, but the liberty should not be abused. The two here mean the same thing; the clause explains the adjective; and, in that case, the noun should be repeated: 'the ultimate end, *the end* on whose account all other ends are desired', 'the end that makes all other ends to be desired'. We should not say 'other *things*', unless we have had already a 'thing'; having begun with 'end', we then say 'other ends'.

The parenthetic clause '(whether we are considering our own good, or that of other people)' need not be so long: 'whether we are considering our own good, or other people's', 'whether we are considering ourselves or others'. Being an inelegant contraction for 'whether we are considering ourselves, *or considering* others', it had better be shortened still farther—'whether for ourselves, or for others.' The position of the clause or phrase after 'desirable', is not objectionable; there is no mistake as to the reference, and we are not always able to place qualifying adjuncts in advance. We could do it here, but we should not gain anything.

'Is an existence exempt as far as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments, both in point of quantity and quality'. Grammatically, the placing of the adjuncts to 'existence' accords with the rules. An adjective laden with circumstances must follow the noun. The adverbial phrase at the end would need to be 'in point both of quantity and of quality'; it is a phrase explanatory of 'rich' as applied to enjoyments. The chief defect of the whole is in rhetorical balance. The author intends 'quantity and quality' to be estimated solely with reference to pleasure; but the double estimate ought also to be made with reference to pain; we desire our pains to be alike few in number and moderate in degree or kind. Accordingly, the qualification should precede and command both members. A simpler expression would suit the occasion, and avoid the complications: 'the end is —to be as free as possible from pains, and as rich as possible in pleasures'; 'to avoid pains to the utmost, and secure pleasures to the utmost'; 'exemption from pains and fruition of pleasures'; 'to have few pains and many enjoyments'.

'The test of quality, and the rule for measuring it against quantity, being the preference felt by those who in their opportunities of experience, to which must be added their habits of self-consciousness and self-observation, are best furnished with the means of comparison'. Being a by-explanation, this is too long. The order of the adjuncts is

unexceptionable. In the second clause, 'it' is feeble, and to repeat the antecedent would be better—'the rule for measuring *quality* against quantity'. The remainder might be shortened:—'being the preference given by such as have the best means of comparison'. So important a question as the contrast between quantity and quality, in pleasure and in pain, should have been disposed of as a preliminary to the main discussion.

'This, being, according to the utilitarian opinion, the end of human action, is necessarily also the standard of morality'. The demonstrative 'this' refers back to the main predicate of the previous sentence—freedom from pains, and abundance of enjoyments. The singular 'this' is somewhat unsuited to a double predicate (even though an obverse couple), and we might avail ourselves of 'such', which expresses neither number. The parenthetical clause, if necessary, is well placed. Not being at the beginning, it is made parenthetic by commas. For 'the end of human action' we could also say, to keep up the closeness of reference—'the ultimate end' (of action, or of conduct; 'human' is understood). In the predicate—'is necessarily also the standard of morality', the order of the adverbial adjuncts is the order of the ideas; first 'necessarily', second 'also' [might be dispensed with]. For 'the standard of morality', say the 'moral standard'; the emphasis being on 'standard'. The whole could be shorter: 'such, then, is the moral standard in the view of Utility'.

'Which may accordingly be defined, the rules and precepts for human conduct, by the observance of which an existence such as has been described might be, to the greatest extent possible, secured to all mankind'. This should be a new sentence, containing in compact form the definition aimed at. The relative 'which' is inadequate to start the subject with dignity and emphasis; not to say that 'which' is feebly employed when made to catch up the word at the end of a previous clause; it should refer to the main subject or else to the entire action of the clause. Begin—'Accordingly, we define the Standard', or 'Accordingly, the Standard is—'.

The definition goes on—'the rules and precepts of human conduct'. 'The standard *is* the *rules*' does not conflict with the letter of plural concord; yet the spirit requires that the predicate noun should be singular—'is the *body* of rules'. We can dispense with the iteration 'rules *and precepts*', and say at once 'rules for human conduct'. We might even leave out 'human conduct' as sufficiently implied, in order to make more salient the essential character of the rules as given in the relative clause—'by the observance of which', 'by whose observance', or simply 'under which', 'by which', 'whereby' [the relative is severely restrictive], or lastly 'for': 'an existence such as has been described', 'the existence now described', 'the lot thus marked out': 'might be, to the greatest extent possible (as far as possible), secured to all mankind'. We might invert—'the rules for securing to all mankind, in the utmost measure, the lot now set forth'; 'for securing, in the highest possible degree, to all mankind the lot above described'.

The writer adds—'and not to them only, but, so far as the nature of things admits, to the whole sentient creation'. Scientifically considered, a definition should be compact; objection may be taken to a detached, supplemental member, like this. It looks like an afterthought; at all events, in the previous sentence where the conditions of a desirable existence are set forth, he considers human beings alone. The addition raises a question so distinct, that it would be better reserved for a separate paragraph, not to say a chapter, where justice might be done to all its specialities. A parenthetic mention would be preferable, if animals are to be brought under the definition: 'rules for securing, in the greatest degree, to all mankind and to the other sentient creatures (the lower animals), the lot now delineated'.

A. KING AND CO., PRINTERS, ABERDEEN.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018